Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-225
Tuesday
22 November 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-225 *22 November 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov on Prospects for Arms Talks *[TASS]* 1
Reagan Statement on Geneva Talks Cited *[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Kashlev on Progress at CSCE Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 19 Nov]* 2
Human Rights Seminar Opens in Moscow 21 Nov 3
Petrovskiy Addresses Participants *[TASS]* 3
Supreme Court's Gusev Speaks *[TASS]* 4
Gerasimov Briefs Press at Foreign Ministry 4
On PNC Session *[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]* 4
On Emigration, Political Prisoners *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 47]* 5
Cuban Announcement on Angola Pullout Noted *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 5
'Roundtable' on India Visit, Asia-Pacific *[Andrianov, Volskiy, Kassis on Moscow Radio]* 6
North Atlantic Assembly Session Opens *[TASS]* 10
West, NATO Claim Credit for Restructuring *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Nov]* 10
NATO Priorities, Woerner Remarks Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 11
Levin on Western Reaction to Restructuring *[Moscow Radio]* 11
New Antiwar Organization Founded *[TASS]* 12
Government Greets Sports Ministers Conference *[TASS]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Lukyanov Receives Congressional Delegation *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 13
TASS Cites Bush Remarks at News Conference 13
Bush Continues To Form Future Administration 13
Three More Cabinet Appointments *[TASS]* 13
Baker Leads White House Team *[Moscow TV]* 13
Post-Geneva Development of U.S. Ties Lauded *[Matveyev in IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]* 14
Preservation of Soviet-U.S. Dialogue 'Vital' *[Kozyakov on Moscow International]* 14
USAF Receives First Delta-2 rockets *[TASS]* 15

Near East & South Asia

Further on Gorbachev Visit to India 15
Visit Termed 'Historic' *[PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 15
Improving Relations Noted *[TASS]* 16
Kornilov Comments *[TASS]* 16
Kornilov on Afghan Statement *[TASS]* 17
Gandhi Award Ceremony Speech *[PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 18
Venkataraman Speech at Ceremony *[PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 20
Gorbachev's 'Perestroyka' Published in Hindi *[TASS]* 21
Deputy Defense Minister Visits Algeria *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Nov]* 22
Arrives in Algiers 21 Nov *[TASS]* 22
Received by Bendjedid *[TASS]* 22
PRAVDA Cites Najibullah's 21 Nov Speech *[22 Nov]* 22
RSFSR Transport Minister Meets Najibullah *[TASS]* 23
Afghanistan Protests to U.S. Over 'Interference' *[TASS]* 23
TASS Summarizes Successful Troop Operations 23
IZVESTIYA Reports on Pakistan Poll Situation *[20 Nov]* 24

TASS Notes Pakistani Polling 'Peaceful' 24
Egypt's Recognition of Palestinian State Viewed *[Surguchev on Moscow Radio]* 24
Recognition of Palestinian State Broadens *[TASS]* 25
Bessmertnykh Cited on Palestinian State *[Moscow International]* 25
Situation of Palestinians in Beirut Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 26
TASS on Soviet-Palestinian Trade Union Talks 26
Libya Denies U.S. Charge on Chemical Weapons *[TASS]* 27

East Europe

Book Published on Gorbachev Meeting With Poles *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 15 Nov]* 27
Book Recalls Katyn Events *[Warsaw Radio]* 28
Shcherbitskiy, Czyrek Sign Cooperation Document *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 28
Kiev Paper on Czyrek Visit *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 16 Nov]* 29
Poland's Czyrek Speaks at Bialystok Meeting *[TASS]* 29
Zaykov Receives Budapest MSZMP Delegation *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 30
Belgrade Rally Demands End to Kosovo 'Drama' *[IZVESTIYA 22 Nov]* 30

West Europe

PRAVDA Notes Geneva Aeroflot Office Bombing *[20 Nov]* 31
Author Cited on French Secret Service *[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]* 31
French Firms in CW Trade Despite Official Policy *[PRAVDA 9 Nov]* 32
Iberian Motives Behind Joining WEU Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 15 Nov]* 33
Business Magazine Published in Finnish Venture *[Moscow International]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Supsov Commission Meets on Republics' Proposals *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Nov]* 36
'Extensive' Conclusion on Estonia *[PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 38
Estonian Laws Would Weaken Union *[PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 38
Lithuania's 'Sajudis' Movement Remains Active 40
Secretary Addresses Rally *[Vilnius International]* 40
Movement Seen as Divisive *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 40
Aims, Methods Analyzed *[IZVESTIYA 13 Nov]* 43
'Sajudis' Member Interviewed *[Warsaw TV]* 47
More on 22 Oct Congress *[Vilnius Radio]* 47
More on RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Estonian Peoples Front's Nurm Interviewed *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 18 Nov]* 49
Estonian Premier on Language, Citizenship Issues *[Rome AVANTI! 19 Nov]* 50
Greens Movement in Estonia Detailed *[TASS]* 51
Georgia Demonstrations Oppose Federal Reforms *[AFP]* 52
Georgian Party Central Committee Plans Staff Cut *[TASS]* 52
Georgia's Museum on Stalin Close. Down *[TASS]* 52
Armenian, Latvian Supreme Soviet Sessions Open *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Armenian Supsov Session Topics *[Yerevan Radio]* 53
Further on Armenian Session *[Yerevan Radio]* 53
New Monthly Newspaper Appears in Yerevan *[Moscow TV]* 53
Unauthorized Construction Work in Armenia *[Baku Radio]* 53
Culture Official Peters' 18 Nov Speech in Riga *[Riga International]* 54
Komsomol Central Committee Plenum Reported *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 55
Polled Lessees Express Lack of Confidence *[Moscow Radio]* 56
'Forbidden Books' Return to Open Stocks *[TASS]* 56
New APN Chairman Vlasov Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 31 Oct]* 57
Academy of Sciences Vice President Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Nov]* 58

Economic

Draft Issued on Estonian Special Economic Zone *[MOLODEZH ESTONII 15 Oct]* 59
Moscow TV Reports on Far East Economic Zones 60
Odessa Oblast Wants Free Economic Zone Created *[IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]* 62
Inadequate Refrigeration Culprit in Meat Spoilage *[Grinko in IZVESTIYA 10 Nov]* 63

Agricultural

Murakhovskiy Speaks at Agro-Industrial Ceremony *[Moscow TV]* 65
Murakhovskiy Interviewed on Agriculture Production *[Moscow Radio]* 65

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Continue Experimentation *[TASS]* 67
Mir Orbiter's Flight Parameters Adjusted *[TASS]* 68
Soviet-Indian Satellite Experiment Scheduled *[TASS]* 68
Nuclear-Powered Vessel Completes Dockside Trials *[TASS]* 69

Military

Italian Daily Interviews General Yazov *[Rome AVANTI! 16 Nov]* 69
Yazov Interviewed Prior to Yugoslav Visit *[Zagreb DANAS 15 Nov]* 70
Strategic Rocket Forces Deputy Chief Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 75

Karpov on Prospects for Arms Talks
LD2211111888 Moscow TASS in English 1047 GMT 22 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—Viktor Karpov, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, highly assessed the experience which the Soviet Union and the United States have gained in the field of nuclear disarmament since the signing of the INF Treaty.

In the first interview he gave to TASS diplomatic correspondent Vadim Biryukov after being appointed to the post, the deputy minister said: "The point now is to ensure a balance of strategic interests which would guarantee the security of the Soviet Union and the United States. The quest for this balance, in my view, should be the subject of the forthcoming talks on the strategic offensive arms issue."

The opinion of the Soviet diplomat is that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue has now reached a qualitatively higher stage: An atmosphere of businesslike cooperation has developed and mutual interests are taken into account. "We can now discuss problems of security in Soviet-U.S. relations with the United States in a way simply inconceivable prior to the Geneva summit," he said. "Of course, problems do exist, but a safety margin has emerged in Soviet-American relations as a result of the meetings between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan".

The Soviet diplomat regards this "as a sign that it will be possible to carry on dialogue with the next U.S. Administration without interruption".

Such issues as strategic offensive arms, reductions in conventional arms and the armed forces, and the elimination of chemical weapons, will undoubtedly be at the centre of attention during talks with representatives of the next U.S. Administration, Viktor Karpov maintained.

Reagan Statement on Geneva Talks Cited
PM1811125588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "President's Statement"]

[Text] Washington, 17 Nov—The White House issued a statement from U.S. President Reagan Wednesday devoted to the results of the 10th round of the Soviet-U.S. nuclear and space arms talks which has ended in Geneva.

The statement says, in particular: We have achieved considerable progress at these talks. We have concluded the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and embarked on its implementation. At the strategic arms limitation talks we also made headway toward our goal—reducing nuclear forces. The participants in the talks recorded broad and important areas in which the sides' positions coincide and areas in which differences remain.

At the strategic arms limitation talks it was stated in particular that we are advancing at full speed toward the conclusion of an agreement which will substantially reduce the ceilings of the U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear arsenals.

At the same time Reagan pointed out that "serious questions causing differences" remain. He included among them questions of mobile ICBM's, sea-launched cruise missiles, rules for counting air-launched cruise missiles, subceilings for warheads on ICBM's, the modernization of heavy ICBM's, and the Soviet proposals that could prevent unimpeded implementation of SDI. The U.S. President stressed yet again that the SDI program "will not be the subject of barter." The United States, Reagan said, "will not accept restrictions on SDI that go beyond the framework of the restrictions agreed upon in the ABM Treaty," although, as is well known, SDI contradicts the provisions of this Soviet-U.S. treaty.

"We leave the next administration a firm foundation on which to build in the future," Reagan stressed in conclusion.

Kashlev on Progress at CSCE Meeting
PM2111120588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Correspondent S. Tosunyan report on interview with Ambassador Yu.B. Kashlev, head of Soviet CSCE delegation: "On the Threshold of Important Decisions"; date, place not given]

[Text] The Vienna meeting of CSCE states has hastened the moment when there is every opportunity for adopting a substantive and balanced final document. IZVESTIYA's correspondent in Austria S. Tosunyan asked Soviet delegation head Ambassador Yu.B. Kashlev to talk about the features of the final document that is being prepared.

"Questions of practical reductions in armed forces and conventional arms will be examined," the Soviet delegation head pointed out, "for the first time in the framework of the all-European process along with security- and confidence-building measures. An exceptionally major step is being taken in the field of human rights and the humanitarian sphere. This may be considered one of the most important achievements of the Vienna meeting. Substantial progress is being outlined in the sphere of culture, information, and environmental protection.

"However, the significance of the Vienna meeting is determined not only by the text of the final document recording the CSCE states' major new political obligations, but also by an extensive program of important measures designed to develop multilateral cooperation in all areas of the Helsinki Final Act.

"The Vienna meeting," Yu.B. Kashlev continued, "has a unique opportunity to construct new stories in the 'all-European home' on the foundations laid in Helsinki. The draft final document presented by the neutral and nonaligned countries this May contains a realistic program for such building. It proposes holding 12 all-European proceedings after the Vienna meeting. The Soviet Union supports them, along with other socialist countries.

"One can boldly assert," Yu.B. Kashlev stressed, "that the implementation of the practically formed consensus on holding two parallel and mutually complementary sets of talks within the framework of the CSCE process—one involving 35 states on security- and confidence-building measures and disarmament and one involving 23 countries on reductions in armed forces and conventional arms from the Atlantic to the Urals—considerably enriches the substance of the 'military dimension' of the all-European process and makes it possible to embark on real steps toward substantially reducing the level of military confrontation on the continent.

"The Vienna meeting may go down in the political history of Europe as a most important landmark in the development of cooperation between states in the field of human rights and humanitarian problems. The final document substantially boosts the level of the political commitments undertaken by member countries in the human rights and humanitarian spheres. For the first time a CSCE document includes a formula for an international pact on a person's right to freedom of movement and the individual's right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country—taking into account solely those restrictions provided for by law and compatible with obligations under international law. No CSCE document has ever contained clauses regarding respect for the citizen's right to contribute actively—independently or jointly with other people—to the development and defense of human rights, or regarding ways to protect people whose rights are being violated or who are subjected to illegal restrictions. This is the first time a document has recorded religious freedoms in such detail and so specifically.

"An accord, stemming from the Helsinki Final Act, on respect for the activity of establishments, organizations, and people aimed at fulfilling the provisions of the CSCE document and on granting them opportunities to freely express their opinions on these questions has undergone further development.

"It is also important that the draft final document stress the prime significance of economic, social, and cultural rights and the need to fully exercise them. The sections on contacts between people and on information, culture, and education also contain many new accords. Personal, family, and business trips are made considerably easier, and the procedure for organizing them has been simplified. For the first time an accord has been recorded on opening cultural centers on a reciprocal basis.

"The accords on the human dimension of the CSCE are assuming exceptional importance. The consultation and cooperation mechanism that is taking shape as a result of these accords is effectively creating a permanent, multifaceted basis for resolving humanitarian problems and defending human rights and freedoms. This effectively extends confidence-building measures to the humanitarian sphere. The conference on the human dimension of the Helsinki process is designed to play a special role in this mechanism. The participants in the Vienna meeting agree that three meetings must be held within the framework of this conference.

"As is well known, back at the start of the Vienna meeting the Soviet Union was the first to propose hosting an all-European event on humanitarian problems. Subsequently, in light of the exchange of opinions that has taken place, the Soviet side proposed making all plenary sessions of the Moscow conference open sessions. Moreover, the Soviet side has stated that the Moscow forum will be held in complete accordance with the practice and standards prevailing within the CSCE, including the conditions for holding comparable conferences in Paris and Copenhagen. This means that the

representatives of foreign nongovernmental organizations, including human rights organizations and groups, and individuals, journalists, and all those who so desire will be able to come to Moscow. After considering our partners' views, we expressed readiness to hold the Moscow forum as the third meeting within the framework of the conference on the human dimension—the first and second will be held in Paris and Copenhagen respectively. We see these three meetings as a triune conference. By and large this is an extremely reasonable and optimum structure, but if someone wants to destroy part of it, then the entire structure will be jeopardized.

"The Soviet delegation has expressed itself in a positive spirit with regard to holding an information forum. Moreover, we took part in elaborating the appropriate document from constructive standpoints, examining the question of freedom to obtain and circulate information as one of man's fundamental rights.

"Now a word about the economic dimension. In Europe's real life, despite the differences in political and economic systems, states are reaching agreements on deals worth billions, the exchange of scientific achievements, advanced technology, and experience in resolving specific problems of economic life is developing, efforts are being pooled in such spheres as controlling the thermonuclear reaction, and the idea of the rational combining of integration processes in Europe is being realized. At the same time," the head of the Soviet delegation pointed out, "in all the years that have elapsed since the adoption of the Final Act there has not been a single measure on this range of problems within the framework or under the auspices of the CSCE. The time has come to rectify this situation.

"The economic conference proposed by the group of neutral and nonaligned countries would make it possible to adopt concrete recommendations on the further development of trade-industrial and credit-financial cooperation. Holding the conference in two phases in Prague and Bonn respectively would reflect the spirit of the times and the mutual interest of East and West in developing business ties on the basis of equality and mutual advantage.

"The environment is, indisputably, in the forefront of all-European problems. The level of all-European cooperation in this sphere is still inadequate. That is why the question of holding a conference on environmental protection is an urgent one.

"We advocate holding a conference on the Mediterranean to examine ways and means of implementing the CSCE states' obligations to help strengthen security and cooperation in this region, including the protection of ecosystems.

"The Soviet delegation supports the proposals to convene a conference of experts for the peaceful settlement of disputes. This initiative fits in well with the mainstream of the new thinking in international affairs. It will, indisputably, help affirm the principle of nonuse of force and the development of civilized forms of interstate relations.

"Finally, the question of the next CSCE meeting. The Soviet Union," the Soviet delegation head said, "supports Finland's proposal to hold the CSCE states' next meeting in Finland's capital —Helsinki."

Human Rights Seminar Opens in Moscow 21 Nov

Petrovskiy Addresses Participants

LD2111122688 Moscow TASS in English 1208 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—"We regard this seminar as a favourable opportunity to learn from U.N. experts what progress has been made the world over in drawing up new international standards and using the existing ones to uphold human rights in the administration of justice. At the same time it will give representatives of the socialist nations a chance to relate their experience in this domain, to compare it with progressive world practices", it was stated here by Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy foreign minister of the USSR. He took the floor at the U.N. regional seminar on "Human Rights and Administration of Justice" which opened here today under the aegis of the USSR on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the universal human rights declaration.

The seminar will look into questions related to the protection of human rights during inquests and court hearings, into the role of public opinion in upholding human rights during the administration of justice. The Soviet Union attaches exceptional importance to questions of enhancing the legal protection of human rights and basic human liberties, of human dignity. Restoration and consolidation of a legal socialist state, elaboration of solid legal and legislative guarantees ensuring the irreversibility of perestroyka, openness and broad democracy processes is the pivotal direction of the Soviet Government's efforts, Vladimir Petrovskiy stressed. He reaffirmed the Soviet Union's adherence to the lofty ideals proclaimed by the universal declaration, as well as the USSR's resolution to ensure maximum humanitarian guarantees of a person's status in face of the law.

This seminar will provide a unique opportunity for a competent dialogue on questions of human rights, it was stated by Jan Martenson, under-secretary general of the United Nations, director of the U.N. Human Rights Centre. He noted that human rights could not be fully ensured without universal peace.

Supreme Court's Gusev Speaks

LD2111231088 Moscow TASS in English 2002 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—"Soviet jurists are convinced that in the protection of human rights it is necessary to proceed from the fundamental right, the right to live in peace, without wars and violence", said Sergey Gusev, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Court of the USSR. He addressed the seminar "Human Rights and the Administering of Justice" that opened here today. The seminar devoted to the 40th anniversary of the universal declaration of human rights is sponsored by the Soviet United Nations Association and is attended by scientists, jurists, United Nations experts, representatives of nongovernmental organizations.

"The perestroyka drive that started in the USSR has resulted in the revision of a number of old approaches and juridical norms", Sergey Gusev said. "But such principles operating now as the equality of all members of society before law, and public trial, should be preserved in a law-governed state for which the Soviet people is striving. All this is preserved in the draft law on amendments and supplements to the Constitution of the USSR which is to be considered by the next session of the Supreme Soviet, the country's parliament".

The jurist noted that a number of new normative acts, specifically, about the freedom of conscience, voluntary societies, about the widening of trade union's rights are now prepared in the USSR. The Supreme Court of the USSR proceeds with the work to eliminate deviations from legality made in the past: For instance, the cases of 310 persons were reviewed from January to September, 1988. There was mitigation of punishment in 97 cases, and 31 convicts were released.

People repressed in the years of Stalin's personality cult are being rehabilitated. Sergey Gusev noted in this connection that the commission of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee for the additional study of materials connected with the repressions of the 30s-40s and early 50s, restored good name to 636 people, among them such prominent leaders of the party and the Soviet state as Nikolayi Bukharin, Konstantin Rykov, Grigory Zinovyev, Lev Kamenev, Yuriy Pyatakov.

Participants in the seminar from Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, other countries spoke about the need for the observance by all states of universal norms ensuring human rights, about the need for the studies of progressive experience in law by other countries.

U.N. expert Erika Daes of Greece called for dialogue in the human rights sphere in the spirit of cooperation. Deputy Chairman of the Human Rights Committee Fausto Pocar of Italy emphasized the importance of including the principles of the universal declaration of human rights in national legislations.

Gerasimov Briefs Press at Foreign Ministry

On PNC Session

PM2111100788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent report: "Meeting With Journalists"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev's participation in the work of the latest UN General Assembly session in New York reflects the great significance which the Soviet Union attaches to this world organization. G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, stated this at a 16 November briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. He expressed the hope that the forthcoming speech by the Soviet head of state at the session's plenary session, in which he will set out the USSR's approach toward the most important problems of world development, will be a major event in international life.

The Soviet Union welcomes the package of decisions adopted at the Palestine National Council session, G.I. Gerasimov declared. At that highest political forum of the Palestinian people an important step was taken toward ensuring more favorable conditions for a Near East settlement. The Palestinian leadership displayed a high degree of realism and a freshness in its approaches to the most important aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The council decisions, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman continued, contain an unambiguous position on the important question of the recognition of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, which are the recognized basis in international law for a Near East settlement, and they contain confirmation of the Palestinian position rejecting methods of terrorism in all its manifestations, including state terrorism.

We particularly note also the profound adherence confirmed by the Palestinians to the settlement of international regional problems by peaceful means in accordance with the UN Charter.

The "declaration of independence" adopted at the session proclaims a Palestinian state within the measures for implementing the Palestinian people's aspirations. The Soviet Union has always acknowledged and continues to acknowledge the Palestinians'right to have their own state. We welcome the declaration on the Palestinian state, which will be created within the framework of a fair, all-embracing Near East settlement, G.I. Gerasimov said.

The decisions of the Palestine National Council confirm to the whole world that the PLO, which is the only expressor of the Palestinian people's interests and is its authoritative political representative, has displayed a high degree of responsibility for the destiny of its people

and the destiny of peace in the Near East. The last doubts expressed by certain circles with regard to the PLO's ability to be a serious partner in the process of settling the Near East conflict have been clearly and authoritatively dispelled. We are convinced that this question will now receive an additional boost to its accelerated development.

We are attentively studying all materials coming in relating to the session which has taken place, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted, and we have entered into contact with the PLO leadership and intend to consult with the permanent members of the Security Council and other interested states with a view to working out further measures to activate steps leading to the practical preparation of an international conference on the Near East.

Journalists were told that great difficulties have been successfully overcome at the talks taking place in Geneva between Angola, Cuba, and the RSA with U.S. mediation on a settlement in southwest Africa. The participants in the talks displayed the will to find compromises on the basis of the balance of interests of all sides involved in the conflict.

On Emigration, Political Prisoners

PM2111115788 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 47, 19-25 Nov 88 (Signed to Press 17 Nov 88) p 7

[Unattributed report: "Press Center"]

[Text] G. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, said at a routine briefing that the so-called "Jewish question" has recently been raised in the West with regard to the USSR and, in particular, that the subject of **the emigration of persons of Jewish nationality from the USSR** has been broached. In this connection G. Gerasimov cited the following data.

Some 5,000 people wishing to take up permanent residence abroad are registered in the USSR today. **During the first 9 months of this year 65,000 people, including 15,700 persons of Jewish nationality, received permission to emigrate.** Seventy-four people who had lodged appropriate applications and received permission then changed their mind. Refusals stand at 1.5 percent of those wishing to leave. The overwhelming majority of these refusals arise out of knowledge of secrets.

The time taken to examine questions relating to emigration in connection with the reunification of families has been reduced to 1 month and, in urgent cases, to 3 days.

G. Gerasimov also touched on the position of persons of Jewish nationality in the Soviet Union. Jews hold 16th place in terms of number among nationalities inhabiting the USSR, the speaker pointed out. Historically, the majority of Soviet Jews consider one of the languages of the USSR's peoples to be their native tongue. Some 17 percent speak Yiddish. We used to regard Hebrew as a foreign language and it was studied in Moscow, Leningrad, and Tbilisi Universities. Private teaching of this language is permitted now, and agreement in principle has been given to the opening of Hebrew study courses in Moscow. There is activity in the sphere of setting up Jewish public organizations. The S. Mikhoels Jewish Cultural Center is being set up under the Jewish Chamber Theater (this theater puts on tours both in our country and abroad, including the United States, Canada, the GDR, the CSSR, and other countries). It has been decided to set up a museum of ancient Jewish culture under the Moscow Choral Synagogue. The Moscow Jewish Cultural and Educational Society is being set up. There are more than 100 synagogues in the country today.

The speaker went on to dwell on the reports **of "political prisoners in the USSR"** being disseminated by Western mass media. He said that fundamentally we cannot agree with the allegation that people are now persecuted in the USSR not for crimes but for their political or religious convictions.

Even "stretching" all the points, it is possible to take as "political" only four articles of the RSFSR Criminal Code: Article 70 (anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda), Article 190/1 (dissemination of deliberately false fabrications denigrating the Soviet state and social system), Article 227 (encroachment upon the person and rights of citizens in the guise of performing religious rites), and Article 142 (violation of the laws on the separation of the church from the state and schools from the church), as well as analogous articles in the union republic codes.

We do not now have a single prisoner under Article 142, and 11 people are continuing to serve sentences under the rest of the said articles. There are also 25 mental patients against whom criminal proceedings were instituted under these articles, but they were not sentenced because the court sent them for compulsory treatment following an expert medical examination.

In response to a question asking **which deputies voted at the last USSR Supreme Soviet session against the draft laws under examination**, G. Gerasimov said that voting in the USSR Supreme Soviet is not by name, that is, it is not done by asking each deputy whether he is "for" or "against." Therefore there is no record of how a particular deputy voted.

Cuban Announcement on Angola Pullout Noted

PM2211093788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Agreement Reached"]

[Text] Havana, 18 Nov—In the course of the informal consultations that have been completed in Geneva within the framework of the talks involving Angola, Cuba, and South Africa, with the United States as

mediator, on the question of a peaceful settlement of the conflict in southwest Africa and the establishment of peace in the region, agreement has been reached on the last of the remaining unresolved questions in the package of accords on the schedule for the withdrawal of Cuban troops, numbering 50,000 officers and men, from Angola. This was stated today on Cuban television by the official spokesman for the Cuban delegation at the quadripartite talks, Alcibiades Hidalgo. He stressed that the Governments of Angola, Cuba, South Africa, and the United States had been informed of this schedule.

The agreement envisages the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola over a 2-year period, he stressed.

'Roundtable' on India Visit, Asia-Pacific

LD2011193588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 20 Nov 88

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, editorial board member of ZA RUBEZHOM; and Vadim Borisovich Kassis, chief editor of GOLOS RODINY and OTCHIZNA]

[Text] [Andrianov] Hello comrades. Taking part in our roundtable meeting today are Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, editorial board member of the weekly ZA RUBEZHOM, and Vadim Borisovich Kassis, chief editor of the newspaper GOLOS RODINY and the journal OTCHIZNA.

The main international event this week has been Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's official friendly visit to India at the invitation of the Indian leadership. Although the final document has yet to be published, it is clear that this Soviet-Indian summit meeting has served as yet another step in reinforcing developing relations between the two countries and has made a major contribution toward consolidating the unique, friendly cooperation between two such different and influential states for the benefit of their own peoples and in the interests of universal security. For it is obvious that over the past few years Soviet-Indian relations have turned into a constantly active and constructive factor of tremendous international significance.

[Kassis] This is quite natural because the relations between our two states are determined by the fact that we have a common goal—the struggle for peace—and similar, or on many issues identical, views on today's main problems. Moreover, Soviet-Indian links are based on unconditional respect for social and political choice. A considerable role here, of course, is played by the traditions of friendliness toward one another, which took root long ago among our peoples. Although the Soviet Union and India have different sociopolitical systems, in their relations—as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has emphasized—they realize the multifaceted potential for partnership between two mighty forces for progress in the contemporary world—socialism and a society born of national liberation.

[Volskiy] On the whole, foreign observers, too—objective observers abroad—are making a fairly unequivocal assessment of Comrade Gorbachev's visit to India. The latest Soviet-Indian summit meeting has been a major international event and an important milestone in relations between the two countries. This meeting between the leaders of two great states has given them an opportunity to continue their dialogue on key bilateral issues on the one hand, and topical problems in international politics on the other.

I think it is symbolic that the talks held in Delhi have been called a new round in the Delhi dialogue for peace and friendship by local journalists.

[Andrianov] And what's more, it's a fruitful dialogue: There are good grounds for saying that by raising the friendship and cooperation between our countries to a new and higher level, the Delhi talks will make a weighty contribution to reinforcing peace both in Asia and elsewhere. After all, the cooperation between our countries has global significance; Soviet-Indian relations are exerting an ever growing influence on the improvement in the international climate.

[Kassis] This is something which, on the whole, is quite logical. It was, after all, the Soviet Union and India which first introduced the new approach to today's core problems into the practice of international relations. We have only to recall that it was precisely this Soviet-Indian dialogue which led to the signing of the first international document imbued with the philosophy of the new thinking. I am referring to the Delhi declaration, which was signed 2 years ago during Comrade Gorbachev's first visit to India. Now, during the current summit meeting, the leaders of the two states have exchanged views on what is being done to fulfill the tasks charted in that historic document, which specified the long-term objectives in the struggle to create a world free of nuclear weapons and violence. What's more, during the talks the emphasis was placed on further developing the ideas contained in the Delhi declaration.

[Volskiy] Yes, and thus we could say that the present Soviet-Indian summit meeting has clearly marked a new stage on the road to implementing the principles of the Delhi declaration, a declaration which serves as an important tool for nuclear disarmament and for improving the entire international situation. This is very significant because the very principles of the Delhi declaration are beginning to determine political thinking in more and more countries around the world. We should not, however, become complacent, lest we forget the most important thing, and this is now extremely essential. What this most important matter boils down to is that

everything possible must be done to facilitate the positive processes begun in nuclear disarmament, to help unlock regional conflicts, and to develop an irreversible dialogue and mutual understanding between states.

[Andrianov] This task is now exceptionally topical given the critical nature of the global changes, which require particular responsibility from all political forces acting to improve international relations. In this respect the fundamental significance of these regular Soviet-Indian summit meetings, both for relations between the two countries and for the whole of international development, is particularly noticeable.

[Kassis] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's present visit will undoubtedly help consolidate Soviet-Indian interaction in world affairs. After all, our countries support each other's initiatives and actions which serve the cause of universal security, help settle regional conflicts, and promote improvements in international relations.

[Volskiy] India is an ardent supporter of the Soviet Union's efforts to stop the arms race, achieve universal and total disarmament, and avert the nuclear threat from all people. The Indian public views positively the Soviet Union's new foreign policy initiatives, which aim at strengthening peace and security and expanding international cooperation on the basis of the new political thinking. Our country, meanwhile, rates highly India's constructive initiatives aimed at liberating mankind from weapons of mass destruction. We also appreciate the great role played by that country as one of the leaders of the Nonaligned Movement and as an active participant in the Group of Six states.

[Andrianov] We have already mentioned that our countries are different from one another; each is following its own path. At the same, however, the relationship between them could serve as a model for relations between states with different social and political systems. The example of Soviet-Indian ties is by no means a political paradox; it is an example with a perfectly clear explanation. The Soviet Union and India have common interests—peace, nuclear disarmament, friendship, and mutually beneficial cooperation. I don't think there's any need to explain at length that the international potential of our relations becomes all the more significant as their bilateral cooperation becomes more substantive.

[Kassis] This cooperation, incidentally, goes back a very long way and testifies to the fact that in the Soviet Union, India also sees a natural ally in the struggle to remove the threat posed to its independence and sovereignty by the imperialist monopolies and the neocolonialist policies of a number of Western countries. It would be appropriate to recall here that as long as 30 or more years ago our country welcomed Jawaharlal Nehru's economic strategy, which aimed at turning India into an economically independent and modern industrial state. Not only did we welcome this, but we also established business contacts which developed intensively and continue to do so.

[Volskiy] All this has already produced some very substantial results: More than 150 facilities have been built in India with Soviet assistance. Moreover, they belong to the key sectors in India's economy. In helping India, the Soviet Union has always tried to ensure that its assistance was in line with the task of turning the country into an economically independent state, so that at present the facilities built under Soviet-Indian cooperation produce 36 percent of India's steel, 32 percent of its aluminum, and 7 percent of its metallurgical equipment, as well as being responsible for 23 percent of oil extraction and 45 percent of oil refining. During Comrade Gorbachev's visit and his talks in Delhi we can clearly perceive that both our countries are striving to bring bilateral cooperation up to a qualitatively new level and, in line with modern trends in the development of science and technology, move over to production cooperation, to create joint enterprises, to develop advanced technologies and materials by joint efforts, and to jointly harness new energy sources.

[Andrianov] One cannot ignore the fact that India is our biggest business partner among the developing countries, while the Soviet Union comes second among India's trading partners. Our trade and economic relations have reached a tremendous scale and have begun making a substantial contribution to the development of both states. In order to make maximum use of this factor in the interests of the two countries' peoples, 2 years ago the Soviet and Indian leaders set a target of increasing mutual trade by two and a half times by 1992. The dynamic development of our trade and economic relations makes us confident that this goal will be achieved and that the volume of Soviet-Indian goods turnover will reach R5 billion.

[Kassis] Comrade Gorbachev's current visit has shown without the slightest doubt that Soviet-Indian relations are gaining momentum and growing. They have not only spread to new areas of cooperation, but have also drawn the broad masses along with them. This was demonstrated by the festivals of India and the Soviet Union, which have served as examples of people's diplomacy in action.

[Volskiy] There's one other thing I'd like to mention. Soviet-Indian cooperation has, of course, not run a smooth course, and this was particularly true during the period of stagnation. Cooperation also suffered from a kind of stagnation, or at least the forms of this cooperation were not renewed for many years. But now this visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to Delhi has stimulated quite a renewal. Indian private capital, for example, which plays a very great role in the Indian economy, has taken little part in cooperation with the Soviet Union

in the past. Various factors were involved here, including, probably, prejudice toward our country on the part of individual representatives of that private capital, and perhaps on our side too there were elements of a dogmatic approach to the problem. But now this is all ending and Indian private capital is becoming widely involved in cooperation, in particular, in such an important element of it as the creation of joint enterprises.

Here is something else we can note: In some of our departments India has at times been looked at as just a developing country, from which there was nothing special we could obtain. But that isn't the case. India is progressing quickly; it has already joined the first 10 countries in the world in terms of industiral production, and—the main thing—the qualitative character of that industry is changing very quickly. For example, computerization is being carried out at a very fast rate in India, and it is no coincidence that computers were listed by Comrade Gorbachev as among the goods which we can obtain from India through economic exchange. But if we are talking on a broader level, then of course this economic cooperation in the most varied forms already embraces not only Soviet-Indian relations, naturally, but to a certain degree the whole Asian and Pacific regions, to which India also belongs. And economic growth is developing quickly now in many of those countries. On the other hand, the restructuring of our national economy which is taking place, in the Asian regions of the country and the Far East in particular—all this is creating a new situation, new preconditions for the Asia-Pacific region to become a region of broad international cooperation.

[Kassis] Speaking at a conference in the town of Orel on 15 November, Comrade Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet Union had put forward new, far-reaching proposals in Krasnoyarsk. Talking in general, during the years of restructuring we have improved, or established for the first time, mutually advantageous relations with a large number of states, both neighboring and very distant, and we have not spoiled these relations with anybody. As for the Krasnoyarsk initiative, it is aimed primarily at consolidating security and cooperation in the very extensive Asia-Pacific region.

[Andrianov] It must be noted that Soviet people are, in general, displaying an immense interest in that part of the globe. That's understandable: Our country is not only a European power, but one of the largest Asian powers too. Its borders are also open to the Pacific Ocean, where navigation by our merchant vessels is not simply traditional, but vitally necessary. That is why any situation in that region is far from a matter of indifference to us. We are clearly aware that the political situation in the Asia-Pacific region is far from trouble-free.

[Volskiy] That really is the case. Let us recall that virtually all the nuclear powers are present in that region: the Soviet Union, China, the United States, and France, which is conducting its nuclear weapons tests there. It is precisely there that economic conflicts arise more and more frequently—between Japan and the United States, in particular. It is precisely there that the trade and economic interests of the new industrial countries which have emerged in the Far East and their developed partners are coming into collision. Let us add that relations are clashing in a very complex manner in, for instance, the great quadrangle of the Soviet Union, the United States, China, and Japan.

[Kassis] I want to add to what has been said that such political oddities as, for example, the military confrontation on the Korean peninsula, have persisted in the region for many years; the Taiwan problem still exists; and one cannot fail to note the complex situation in Cambodia. There are also anomalies of a different sort: For instance, to this day there is no peace treaty between our country and Japan, and there are no diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea. I shall add that the United States also has no diplomatic relations with Vietnam and the DPRK.

[Andrianov] And here is something else which is noteworthy. The United States' imperialist policy has led to a rapid militarization of the region, including, naturally, the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Moreover, Washington is being blatantly played up to by its allies.

[Volskiy] In this connection I would like to note yet another characteristic of that region which is of no little importance. Virtually all the countries there, and particularly the large ones, regard their neighbors as a potential threat. The enemy image is most often, of course, imaginary and unreal, and yet it engenders an atmosphere of instability and concern—which could lead at any time to another armed conflict, on one scale or another.

[Kassis] Having evaluated that situation, Moscow decided at one time to begin a sober, thorough search for positive improvements throughout the Asia-Pacific region. That well-considered step was the basis of Comrade Gorbachev's closely argued Vladivostok speech. Many observers called it a restructuring of international relations in the Asia-Pacific region.

[Andrianov] You'll agree that this is, indeed, the new political thinking in action. It is precisely this which has brought us onto the road of expanding contacts with representatives of other states, from the top people in parties and governments to ordinary workers and, if you like, even schoolchildren.

[Volskiy] But our position is distinguished, above all, by its specific character, realism, scale...

[Andrianov, interrupting] Yet when we talk about new thinking and political restructuring in the Asia-Pacific region, I want to stress that these processes cannot

always proceed along a one-way street. Take, for example, the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles—I stress, of the Soviet missiles in Asia. You see, that is being carried out exclusively by us.

[Volskiy] Essentially all of the Soviet Union's military activities in the Asia-Pacific region are completely defensive. But if we examine the scale of Washington's military activities in both the Pacific and Indian Oceans, what is striking is the buildup and offensive nature of its activities. Last year the U.S. researcher Gervasi published these figures for the two oceans mentioned: The Soviet Union and its allies do not have a single aircraft carrier there, while the United States has seven. Or the figures for naval airplanes: The Soviet Union has 461 airplanes, but the United States has 1,016 airplanes and its allies have another 334 naval airplanes.

[Kassis] And believe me, the United States and its allies greatly surpass the Soviet Union in terms of other types of weapons as well. We have every reason to be uneasy about our security in the region.

[Andrianov] The elaboration of a peace program for the Asia-Pacific region is immensely important. But any program should not gather dust, should not lie like a deadweight on the desks of diplomats or military officials. I want to recall that the Soviet initiatives aimed at settling regional conflicts and expanding coperation did not spring from nowhere. We remember the Panca Sila and Bandung principles, the peace initiatives from regional socialist countries, as well as India and certain ASEAN states. A number of UN recommendations were also reflected in the Soviet proposals.

[Volskiy] I would add the Delhi declaration which we have already talked about today. It expressed the clear idea of a convention forbidding the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Imagine how important such a convention would be to the Asia-Pacific region. Furthermore, I think that at first both the Soviet Union and China, as well as India, could be participants in the convention. Generally the Soviet Union proceeds from the workable premise that there are no problems in the Asia-Pacific region that cannot be resolved given goodwill and provided that there is no outside interference.

[Kassis] If one talks specifically, then relaxation in the regional situation will undoubtedly serve to improve Soviet-PRC relations. Our country is fulfilling the decision to withdraw the Soviet limited troop contingent from Afghanistan strictly according to plan. In keeping with the Geneva agreements 50 percent of our troops were withdrawn over 3 months. But here again we are compelled to note that the United States is not fulfilling its obligations regarding Afghanistan and is supporting the bandit formations morally and materially via Pakistan. One is forced to ask the question: What stance will the 41st U.S. president, George Bush, adopt on this acute matter, and how will the new administration implement continuity in U.S. foreign policy?

[Andrianov] I want to recall some other positive events that have occurred recently in the Asia-Pacific region. First and foremost, specific steps have been taken to unblock the Cambodian conflict. This was demonstrated particularly graphically after the SRV Government decided to withdraw half of its troops from Cambodia by the end of the year. Steps toward lessening the tension on the borders of the Soviet Union, the PRC, and Mongolia have also been taken. Let us note the fact that part of the Soviet military contingent has already been withdrawn from Mongolian territory. A ray of hope has appeared in the protracted bloodshed between Iran and Iraq. It would appear that the ice has also started to break on the Korean peninsula. Representatives of the DPRK and South Korea have managed to bring their positions closer together. There is an accord on a joint session of the parliaments of the North and South. All this of course is having a positive effect on improving the situation in the region, although this process, it must be added, is far from easy and requires common sense and patience.

[Volskiy] You mentioned the end of the Iran-Iraq war. But now the time has probably come to switch from the Far East—to which we have rightly devoted a lot of attention today—to the Near East, where very important events are also happening at the moment. I mean primarily the proclamation of an independent state of Palestine by the Palestine National Council and recognition of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 which, it is generally believed, signifies to all intents and purposes that Palestinians recognize Israel's right to exist.

Apart from this the Palestine National Council unequivocally condemned international terrorism, which is also very important, and not only in light of the accusations of terrorism addressed at the Palestinians, which became a kind of constant propaganda cliche in the West. This is also important because it shows the increased maturity and responsibiity of the Palestinian movement, which is prepared to take the destiny of this people and its homeland into its own hands and to make a contribution to the efforts aimed at settling the conflict in the Near East. There is only one way to such a settlement, that is, an international conference which...[changes thought] An international conference which the Palestine National Council also spoke in favor of.

Of course there is still a long way to go before peace is established in the Near East. The recent elections in Israel and the course of forming a new government show this clearly. The leader of the right-wing Likud bloc, Shamir, is resolutely opposed to an international conference on the Near East. And the leaders of certain religious parties that intend to join with him in a coalition cabinet even advance the slogan of the so-called Greater Israel.

[Andrianov] Dmitriy Antonovich, I think it would be appropriate here to give some more precise definitions. The slogan Greater Israel usually implies Israel itself plus

the territories occupied by it in 1967. But sometimes this concept is interpreted more broadly. It is usually the extremist circles which use this interpretation—of extending the borders of Greater Israel all the way to the Nile and the Euphrates.

[Volskiy] Well, I think that now everyone understands that this is an unachievable fantasy. But keeping the occupied Arab territories is no longer a fantasy, but a political goal. True, a question of no small importance arises. Making the occupied Arab lands part of Israel now, with the proclamation of the Palestinian state—that is the constructive position that the Palestinians have adopted—would put the Israeli Government in an exceptionally unfavorable situation in the international arena. Even in the eyes of its own allies it would be compromised. There is yet another factor. The Israeli population, as the very same elections that we were talking about have shown, is now far from being united, as it was to a great extent in the past. It is becoming much more difficult for Israel to resist a settlement because of this. The elections have shown that Israel's population is virtually divided into two halves—into those who want a compromise with the Arab countries and those who reject compromise and are aggravating the situation.

In these conditions, it will of course be much more difficult for the Israeli leadership to oppose a settlement. I think, however, that it is a matter of the confrontation between the forces of peace and the forces resisting the strengthening of peace both in the Near East and beyond it, and this confrontation determines the international situation that is taking shape in this region.

[Andrianov] With that we end our rountable meeting. All its participants thank you for your attention, esteemed comrades—radio listeners. Thank you, all the best.

North Atlantic Assembly Session Opens

LD2111165988 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Lisbon November 21 TASS—The 34th autumn session of the North Atlantic Assembly opened here in Estoroil, a suburb of the Portuguese capital. The session, held behind closed doors, is attended by Manfred Woerner, NATO's secretary-general, General John Galvin, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, Francis Pym, president of the North Atlantic Assembly. On the Portuguese side, the session is attended by the country's Prime Minister Anibal Cavaco Silva, National Defence Minister Eurico de Melo and other officials.

According to news agency reports, the chief item on the agenda of the session is West-East relations in the light of the Soviet-American INF Treaty.

West, NATO Claim Credit for Restructuring

PM1811161388 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Nov 88 Second Edition p 5

[A. Bogomolov "Rejoinder": "Restructuring Was Started by... NATO"]

[Text] Why did restructuring, which today has captured the hearts of millions of people in our country and abroad, emerge in the USSR, and why is it in full swing? Because of the realization of the necessity for a revolutionary surge in all spheres of our life? Because of agonizing thoughts about how to enrich the people's spiritual and material life? Because of the rethinking of our historical past, which forces us to look again at the future? A string of answers could be produced—but you will hardly guess what NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner thinks about this subject.

On the eve of the fall session of the North Atlantic Assembly—NATO's consultative organ—Woerner gave an interview to the BILD AM SONTAG newspaper in which he said, in particular: "I am alarmed by the weakening of the will for defense. Many people forget that without our guaranteed defense and without our successfully operating alliance, there would be no glasnost and restructuring in the Soviet Union."

From time immemorial it has always been the norm for an attractive idea to be latched onto by a mass of people who have absolutely nothing to do with its advancement or formulation. And the thesis that restructuring and glasnost were spawned in the West can very often be found in speeches by Western politicians, in newspapers, and heard on radio and television.

But Woerner's present statement is noteworthy because it was heard in the context of quite an active discussion in the West between two viewpoints on what is happening in the USSR: between those who believe that restructuring is advantageous to them because it provides the opportunity to have a partner, and not an enemy, in the East; and those who think that this will result in the West having an even stronger enemy.

The supporters of the second approach are disturbed by signs of the new thinking in the world: the increasing number of state visits, progress on the path of disarmament, and an increase in friendly feelings toward our country among ordinary people. A. Biehle, chairman of an FRG Bundestag commission, wrote recently: "The sense of a threat to our freedom has largely declined among our population. Only 25 percent of people now think that the Soviet Union threatens us. Back at the beginning of the 1980's, 58 percent gave a negative response when asked whether or not the Soviet Union could be trusted."

The alarm is being sounded in Atlantic circles. In the U.S. Congress a draft law is being formulated with the aim of punishing U.S. branches of foreign banks that

offer credits to Moscow; the question of the modernization of conventional and nuclear weapons remaining in Europe after the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is being raised at the most diverse forums; and those people who for many years worked to inflate the subject of the "Soviet military threat" are reactivating themselves. All forces are being thrown into the fight against restructuring, and no one is embarrassed by the fact that this is taking place to the accompaniment of talk about its originating in the West.

NATO Priorities, Woerner Remarks Questioned

PM1811131088 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Vladimir Mikheyev article: "NATO Priorities"]

[Text] To take someone up on his words—this common expression often implies that the person who spoke will not keep his word. And the person who decides to keep an eye on the correlation between words and deeds takes on the role of a "government inspector."

The artificiality of this allocation of roles seems to cause no embarrassment to NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner, who stated in Rome last Thursday that since the Soviet Union is talking about its "new approaches to defense issues," the problem of conventional arms should be the touchstone for the seriousness of such declarations. "It is here," the former FRG war minister promised, "that we will check on it."

Remember: The formula "let's wait and see," which was what Western Europe's first reaction to Moscow's proclamation of the principles of the new political thinking amounted to, was soon improved on and took on an aggressive nature: The West, it was said, should set the Soviet Union a tough test of its adherence to the foreign policy priorities it has declared, should test its sincerity when it speaks of the primacy of common human values. And should take it up on what it says when the emphasis is on reasonable compromises bringing us closer to a more secure and just world.

It is as if there had never been the climb up the rungs of the four USSR-U.S. summit meetings, the dialogue with heads of a number of states and governments in Western Europe, the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the decision to withdraw Soviet troops from Afghanistan, and the well-considered, realistic program, based on a balance of interests, for conventional arms reduction in such a large geographical zone as from the Atlantic to the Urals. These are facts. There is no getting away from them. When M. Woerner claims that NATO "sees an opportunity to establish a new international order," one cannot help measuring this against another event.

Meeting in Luxembourg, the defense ministers of 13 West Eruopean countries took another step toward the formation of an integrated "common market"—an arms market. The goal, according to one of the participants, is "to raise the technological standard of the European arms industry," to which end three major projects have already been approved, including one on the joint development and production of the "European fighter of the nineties," capable of carrying both conventional and nuclear weapons, and one on the creation of the "Helios" European spy satellite.

Who will gain from the political and economic integration of Western Europe acquiring a strongly militarist flavor; how can the all-European bargaining over weapons and the plans to "modernize" nuclear arsenals be compatible with what the NATO secretary general calls the opportunity to "establish a new international order"? And another thing. M. Woerner assured us: "The Atlantic alliance firmly intends to make use of the least opportunity to improve East-West relations."

There is indeed a temptation not to let this opportunity slip, but to take him up on his words.

Levin on Western Reaction to Restructuring

LD2111234388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] On one and the same day, in two countries—Britain and the FRG—newspapers with a certain influence, THE SUNDAY TIMES and WELT AM SONNTAG, published articles that said virtually the same thing. THE SUNDAY TIMES warned its readers of the necessity of maintaining vigilance toward the Soviet Union, while WELT AM SONNTAG, through the words of former U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger, warned that the West might have to pay dearly for being trusting. Why has a certain section of the Western press started such a campaign? Viktor Levin shares his opinion on this:

[Levin] The essence of the matter is that trust in the Soviet Union has grown considerably in Western Europe in recent years. The expression "the Gorbachev effect" has now even entered the political lexicon. This term covers the Soviet leader's popularity, based on the Soviet Union's clear-cut and clearly expressed peace-loving course. Lamentations are to be heard in certain circles in the West—we must, they say, continue to base NATO on the strategy of deterrence—but people are asking why fantastic sums have to be spent, since the Soviet Union is not only not manifesting aggressive intentions, but is consistently working toward radical cuts in armed forces and weapons.

The champions of the plans for so-called modernization of battlefield nuclear weapons, that is, weapons with a range of up to 500 km, are particularly agitated. Massive pressure on the public and on political figures who express doubts about the expediency of accelerated implementation of such plans is being applied in NATO circles. The generals—and not only the generals, but many heads of government of the NATO states, among

whom I would name first and foremost UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher—are demanding that implementation of the modernization plans be embarked upon as soon as possible. But FRG Foreign Minister Hans Dietrich Genscher, for example, to say nothing of representatives of the public, believes that there is no need to hurry at all. Let's put the Russians to the test, says Genscher, and see how they are going to behave at the talks on reductions of armed forces and weapons, and then we can decide later about modernization of nuclear weapons.

Those who support whipping up the arms race cannot put anything up against the weighty and convincing arguments other than unsubstantiated assertions that the course might change in the Soviet Union and that strength will make the Russians more pliable. Therefore, it is no surprise that their assertions, as shown by public opinion polls, make no impression. After all, merely concluding the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, in which—since we are talking about the USSR's real stance—the aspiration for arms restrictions was clearly reflected, outweighs the moss- covered arguments and patently played-up fears. If they really are afraid of anything in the West, and by the way those who are afraid are the ones who would like not to reduce but to invigorate the arms race, then they are afraid of the growing pressure of public opinion on governments, facing them with an agonizing choice of looking boldly ahead or of stubbornly dragging things backwards. Since the tendency to destroy stereotypes decisively is gathering force, the supporters of strong-arm policies, who have by no means conceded yet, are trying to lead the public astray. This explains such articles as those in THE SUNDAY TIMES and WELT AM SONNTAG. But the more such articles appear, the clearer it becomes that they are not producing the desired effect.

New Antiwar Organization Founded

LD2011172788 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 20 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 20 TASS—The World Family, a Soviet voluntary public organisation which is an integral part of the world anti-war public organisation of the same name, has as its task to contribute to the development of friendly relations between various nationalities and peoples of the USSR and also of foreign countries, help strengthen the Soviet Union's cultural, scientific-technical and economic links with foreign states.

At its founding congress today the organisation adopted its statutes and elected the great council and presidium.

As the members of this organisation see it, the World Family should become the generator of the philosophy of people's diplomacy in the USSR.

Government Greets Sports Ministers Conference

LD2111005088 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 20 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—The second world conference of ministers of physical education and sport is a major event in the world community's sports life, which is meant to give a fresh impetus to the development of international cooperation in this field, says a message of greetings sent by the Soviet Government to the participants and guests of the conference in Moscow.

"Your conference takes place under the auspices of UNESCO which makes a conspicuous contribution to the process of ameliorating the international situation. The number of sports events which facilitate the extension of friendly ties among nations has increased over the ten years that have passed since the founding of the UNESCO Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport.

"The second world conference of ministers of physical education and sport, which plans to consider such pressing issues as involvement of the world sports community in the movement to remove the threat of a nuclear war and preserve peace on earth, a further development of mass sport, defence of its ethic values, and the struggle against the negative phenomena in sport, also serves as an example of this", the message of greetings says.

United States & Canada

Lukyanov Receives Congressional Delegation

PM2211092988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Congressmen's Sojourn"]

[Text] Anatoliy Lukyanov, alternate member of the CPSU Central Committe Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received in the Kremlin today a group of U.S. congressmen.

The congressmen, led by representative Steny Hoyer and Senator Dennis Deconcini, co-chairmen of the Congressional Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, took part in a Soviet-American inter-parliamentary seminar on humanitarian cooperation and human rights.

In a conversation that was held in a frank and business-like atmosphere, Lukyanov described the reform of the political system in the Soviet Union.

The congressmen evinced great interest in the information about the efforts undertaken by the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) in this direction and the course of the broad nationwide discussion of amendments and changes to the USSR Constitution.

It was noted that democratization, glasnost, and consolidation of human rights guarantees in the country not only met the internal requirements of present-day Soviet society, but also filled with a new content the discussion of humanitarian problems on a global scale.

The favorable influence of new political thinking on the world situation opened up prospects for settling many complicated problems that only recently had been considered impossible to resolve.

Stressed during the meeting was the great importance of the future Soviet-American summit for the consolidation of the course toward improving relations between the USSR and the United States and deepening mutually beneficial cooperation in various fields.

Attention was paid to the significance of the development of Soviet-American political dialogue on a broad range of issues and at other levels, including meetings and exchanges of views between parliamentarians from the two countries.

Both sides observed that a constructive, unbiased discussion of humanitarian issues, including at interparliamentary seminars, would facilitate the overall improvement of the climate of Soviet-American relations and deepen mutual understanding and growth of their trust in each other.

Lukyanov replied to questions by U.S. legislators on various aspects of the process of democratization in Soviet society.

TASS Cites Bush Remarks at News Conference

LD2211113888 Moscow TASS in English 1125 GMT 22 Nov 88

[Text] Washington November 22 TASS—"We look forward to continual improvement in the bilateral relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union," George Bush, U.S. vice-president and the new president elect, told journalists in Washington today.

"I really believe," Bush went on to say, "we have an enormous opportunity, as I said in the campaign and still feel, to make this world a safer place, a freer place, a place where the regional tensions are down. It is my intention to stay along these general lines."

Touching upon the forthcoming meeting of the Soviet and American leaders, Bush said: "It's President Reagan's meeting, I will be there as vice president of the United States."

He emphasized further that he would not accept or reject any proposals until he became President of the United States.

"I will put together a national security team that will review and revise policies, existing policies, and set forward my national security and foreign policy objectives for this country," Bush said.

Bush Continues To Form Future Administration

Three More Cabinet Appointments

LD2111203288 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Washington November 21 tass—President-elect George Bush has announced at a press conference here three more appointments in his future administration. Lauro Cavazos and Richard Thornburgh, who are, respectively, secretary of education and attorney-general in the present administration, will keep their jobs. Richard Darman, who previously held, among others, the post of deputy secretary of finance, will be appointed director of Office of Management and Budget.

Baker Leads White House Team

OW2111045588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 17 Nov 88

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] Leading assistants of President-elect George Bush who are determining the structure of the White House organization form a three-man team: Craig Fuller, current head of Bush's organization; Robert Teeter, author

of the election campaign strategy who also organized the public opinion polls; and Governor John Sununu, who is now to resign that position. James Baker, who led Bush's campaign and who is now his candidate for the post of the secretary of state, had a detailed a discussion with these three men on how they could jointly hold the post of White House chief of staff.

The U.S. press continues to write a lot about Baker, the Texan aristocrat and lawyer. I think our viewers will be interested to know something about the future leader of the U.S. foreign affairs administration, George Bush's right-hand man. They met as early as 30 years ago. The elegant 58-year-old former Marine, who graduated from the two most prestigious universities, has for a long time been reputed to be a smiling gentleman capable of disarming his opponents, and, at the same time, an imperious man. It is true that his experience in foreign policy is relatively poor. In the Reagan administration, Baker was White House chief of staff for 4 years, and then became Secretary of the Treasury.

Journalists and political experts, nevertheless, consider Jim Baker better suited for the post of secretary of state than others. They believe that one should not isolate the experience in foreign political affairs from that in foreign economic affairs, and Baker has plenty of the latter. Indeed, the secretary of state should not necessarily be the best specialist in the world in all nuances of foreign policy. What he needs is a sharp mind and strategic thinking. They consider all these qualities are inherent in Baker.

Post-Geneva Development of U.S. Ties Lauded

PM2111144588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 1

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Publicist's Remarks": "The Great Art"]

[Text] Time does not march step by step, it actually flies. It seems only yesterday that we sat in front of our television sets watching scenes that were rather unusual for us, reporting the USSR and U.S. leaders' meeting in Geneva. That was 3 years ago, in 1985. That Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was the first in 6 and ½ years.

Speaking at the Geneva news conference at the time, M.S. Gorbachev said: The time has come when, in the face of the threat of universal nuclear danger, we must learn the great art of living together.

How difficult some steps in diplomacy can be at times, steps which seem elementary but necessary, when an unfavorable atmosphere prevails! The very possibility of a direct conversation between the leaders of our two states was perceived as something sensational and profoundly dramatic by some politicians and by the journalistic fraternity in the world. Doubts were being voiced: Has the confrontation between the two powers not gone rather too far to expect even a useful outcome of the meeting, let alone some accord?

There were no such doubts in Moscow. On the contrary, we were well aware: The situation in the world was too dangerous to ignore even the slightest chance to correct the situation, to advance toward more stable bilateral relations and a more lasting peace.

At that time, in Geneva, there was no success in achieving any formal accords in the shape of agreements. But that summit meeting was the starting point for the desired stable development of bilateral relations and for the preparation of agreements that were not even dreamed of by the greatest optimists in the past.

What lay at the basis of the positive development which emerged? Primarily the mutual realization and awareness of the fact that a nuclear war is impermissible, that it must not be fought, and that there can be no victors in it. This realization was followed by practical conclusions for the governments of both countries, for advancement.

The 3 years that have passed since the Geneva meeting are a relatively brief time period. And against the background of the postwar period, they are altogether a fleeting chronological moment. Especially since these were decades when the problem of disarmament remained a block on which diplomacy broke its teeth. But these 3 years have proved that the start made in Geneva was followed by sound development. The chance was not missed.

Of course, now there is no need to beat the drums, but we can and must express a sense of profound gratification with the real achievements in the sphere of Soviet-U.S. relations on the way toward radical measures in the disarmament sphere. Soviet-U.S. contacts at all levels today are no longer the center of inflamed passions, while great and painstaking work is being done on new and important accords for the sake of stable and secure peace. We are successfully learning the art of joint coexistence and joint cooperation at the level of constructive diplomacy.

Nothing succeeds like success, as the English proverb says. Relations between our countries must continue to develop in just as dynamic a spirit in the future. The whole world will gain from it.

Preservation of Soviet-U.S. Dialogue 'Vital'

LD2011020088 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 19 Nov 88

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Three years have passed since the Geneva Soviet-American summit. More from Vladislav Kozyakov. Here is what he writes:

Recalling his first meeting with Ronald Reagan, Mikhail Gorbachev says in his book "Perestroyka and New Thinking" that both leaders realized there was a common ground to improve Soviet-American relations. It was the realization of the fact that a nuclear war must not be allowed to begin and that there would be no victor. The Geneva summit failed to find the solutions to the cardinal problems of stopping the arms race and promoting peace.

The 3 years that have passed since the meeting have not been easy. Nevertheless, the search for mutual understanding begun at the first summit meeting has brought about significant results. The Geneva meeting was followed by summits in Reykjavik, Washington, and Moscow. For the first time, the two countries concluded an agreement on scrapping a part of the Soviet-American nuclear arsenals and created the basis for a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons with observance of the ABM Treaty.

Of course, it took joint effort to reach this result. The Soviet Union made its contribution with its policy of restructuring and new thinking by the rejection by the leadership led by Mikhail Gorbachev of many dogmatic approaches which characterized Soviet foreign policy in the past. Also the USSR called for more openness in relations between the two countries and stressed its readiness to carry out on-site inspections. The United States also took several steps forward. President Reagan gave up some of the past stereotypes.

Now, in connection with the forthcoming change of the U.S. Administration, it is vital to preserve the ongoing process. In the message of greeting to George Bush following his election, Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the readiness to further promote cooperation on a whole range of issues.

The Soviet leader's forthcoming trip to New York to speak at the United Nations will take place early next month and will give another opportunity to continue the summit talks. During his visit to the United States, the Soviet leader is to meet Ronald Reagan and George Bush. It is believed in Moscow that both countries should spare no effort or leave any time in promoting bilateral cooperation and international security.

Speaking about the Soviet-American dialogue, Mikhail Gorbachev said the time of choice had passed. Now our goodwill, political maturity, and reason are being tested.

USAF Receives First Delta-2 rockets

LD1811023888 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 17 Nov 88

[Text] New York November 17 TASS—The U.S. Air Force received the first Delta-2 space rocket on Wednesday. A ceremony officially to put into operation the launch site for the rocket took place at cosmodrome on Cape Canaveral, Florida.

The new vehicle for the delivery of military payloads to outer space has a greater lift than its predecessors, the Delta-1, by means of which 170 satellites, among them military ones, have been launched into the near-earth space over the past 28 years.

Lieutenant-General Donald Cromer, the head of the Space Command of the Air Force, said at the ceremony that this is a very important step towards securing a guaranteed launching of payloads which are of importance to U.S. national security.

He said the first launch of the Delt-2 would take place in Decembers this year. The space rocket is to put into orbit two navigation satellites which, as he put it, would revolutionise the military planning and troop deployment process.

The Air Force had placed an order with the McDonnell-Douglas Astronautics for 14 Delta-2 rockets.

Near East & South Asia

Further on Gorbachev Visit to India

Visit Termed 'Historic'

PM2211101188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 88 Second Edition p 1

[Report by own correspondents V. Baykov and O. Kitsenko: "High Degree of Maturity"]

[Text] Delhi, 20 Nov—Once again traditional arches made from real flowers and banners honoring Indian-Soviet friendship adorned the central avenues and streets of Delhi today. The Indian capital bid a warm farewell to M.S. Gorbachev, who has just completed an official friendly visit to India.

M.S. Gorbachev was in India for just under 3 days, but these days were historic. They entered a bright new page in the chronicle of friendship and cooperation between our countries' peoples.

Indian-Soviet relations, the NATIONAL HERALD newspaper writes, can really be considered a model of peaceful coexistence between two different social systems. They are characterized by a number of features of particular interest: The countries' global aims in the sphere of ensuring peace coincide, as do vitally important interests in certain spheres; a high degree of maturity has been demonstrated in political relations, due to which they have been preserved in spite of pressure and conflicts; the change of leadership in both countries has not hampered the development of their interstate ties.

M.S. Gorbachev's second visit to Delhi, the PATRIOT newspaper notes, is no less significant than the first in November 1986, the result of which was the signing of the Delhi Declaration. His warning about the possible dangerous consequences of Pakistani and U.S. deviation

from the Geneva accords on Afghanistan has great significance for the life of the international community. The Soviet leader's call to reject the strategy of confrontation, the support he expressed for the Nonaligned Movement, and the Soviet Union's adherence to joint actions with the developing countries in efforts to back a global system of economic security are equally significant.

In conversation with us S. Mugerji [name as transliterated], a leading Indian journalist and chief of the CNS agency, expressed Indian society's profound satisfaction with the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit. Not only was speculation about an alleged decline in relations dispelled, but it was also demonstrated that these relations are expanding in all spheres. If one takes the economic aspect, for example, then our cooperation will take in promising new areas. In the political sphere a similarity of approach to the key problems of the process of nuclear disarmament, ensuring peace and stability in the extensive Asia-Pacific region, and the necessity of establishing fair international economic relations was once again confirmed.

Indian business circles believe that the accords reached during the visit make it possible for our countries to deepen our economic cooperation significantly in the interests of the two countries' peoples, using new methods and forms for the purpose. "President M. Gorbachev and Prime Minister R. Gandhi," the ECONOMIC TIMES newspaper writes, "have reached the conviction that there is a requirement for close collaboration to further expand and deepen bilateral economic ties. In particular, this applies to the coordination of our economic planning at a time when our two countries are busy formulating their next 5-year plans."

But let us return to the streets of the Indian capital. We are among the send-off crowd. People are enthusiastically waving Indian and Soviet flags. A young, turbaned Indian standing next to us shouts out unexpectedly in Russian: "Goodbye. I hope we see you again!"

Improving Relations Noted

LD2111120588 Moscow TASS in English 1137 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent Soviet-Indian relations have been improving for several decades now. The official friendly visit to India by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which has just ended, has undoubtedly brought relations between the two countries to a higher level of mutual understanding and cooperation.

It can be confidently said that the Soviet festival in India and Indian festival in the USSR have brought our peoples closer together. In fact the festivals became a unique form of people's diplomacy. The main provisions of the Soviet-Indian summit statement are based on the innermost aspirations and wishes of the Soviet and Indian peoples. This is confirmed above all by the idea incorporated in the document that the contemporary interdependent world is mankind's common home and every nation has the right to use its resources.

The Soviet Union and India both advocate the participation of all nuclear-weapons states in the the process of nuclear disarmament. The Soviet programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and the Indian action plan for establishing a nuclear-free and non-violent world by 2010 together form an extended proposal addressed to the international community. The Soviet Union and India confirmed their determination to help achieve the aims incorporated in the 1987 U.N. declaration "Indian Ocean a Zone of Peace". The two nations are in favour of dismantling all military bases in the Indian Ocean and preventing construction of new ones. They comdenm attempts to build up foreign presence in the Indian Ocean. The two nations call for the earliest convocation of an international conference on the Indian Ocean to be held no later than in 1990.

The Soviet Union believes that strengthening international security in the Asian and Pacific region is the key to a global normalization of the political situation. The Delhi Declaration as well as the initiatives set out in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk are an invitation, addressed to the international community, to look for ways of improving the situation in the region. All interested countries, including the United States, should participate in this process.

Of course the problems of the region cannot be resolved without cooperation and understanding between the USSR, India and China. The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that good relations between these countries are crucial for the destiny of Asia and world progress.

Kornilov Comments

LD2111133088 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2130 GMT 20 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow, 21 Nov (TASS)—TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

"The main thing now is to do everything possible to ensure that the positive processes that have begun in nuclear disarmament, in the unblocking of regional conflicts, and the development of dialogue and mutual understanding between states, develop elements of irreversibility." This was said by Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech in Delhi on 18 November and these words clearly and fully express the main trend of the Soviet-Indian summit meeting that ended Sunday. During this meeting a very broad range of problems was discussed. But if one singles out the main, the most important element there are complete grounds for saying: The talks centered on the role that the USSR and India play and can play in

resolving the common world task facing mankind, that of forming guarantees for its survival and ensuring suitable living conditions for future generations.

Life itself gives the answer to this question, and the present talks have reaffirmed that, representing one-fifth of the earth's population the Soviet Union and India are successfully realizing and firmly intend to continue to realize the multifaceted potential of the partnership between two powerful forces of world progress—socialism and a society born from national liberation. Both countries mutually support the initiatives and actions that serve the cause of universal security, and they call on the international community again and again to jointly seek paths toward a nuclear weapon-free and nonviolent world. At the basis of these joint calls and actions aimed at bringing the ideas of the Delhi Declaration further into international politics, is the similarity, and on many occasions, coincidence of Moscow's and Delhi's views on the meaning and objectives of the international process. They are based on goodwill, experience, mutual trust, and confidence in the reliability of the partnership.

"The world needs a comprehensive system of global security that will allow us all to live in conditions of peace, equality, and mutual respect," stressed India's Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi during the Soviet-Indian meetings. Soviet people wholly and fully share this approach. Our country firmly intends to move toward the creation of a worldwide system not only of political security but also of economic security, hand in hand with the developing states. The Soviet Union has and does support the idea of an international convention that would outlaw the very threat of using nuclear weapons. As stressed in the Soviet-Indian summit statement, both Moscow and Delhi are convinced of the fact that it is essential as soon as possible to halt and ban nuclear weapons testing, to avert the arms race from space, and to conclude an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear weapons. The interests of global security insistently call for the elimination of "hot spots" and both Moscow and Delhi are in favor of quenching regional conflagrations in the near future. They confirm their support for the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan and call for them to be unswervingly and honorably fulfilled by all. They are in favor of sources of tension everywhere being eliminated, from the Near East to Cambodia and the Korean peninsula.

There is no need to say that the international potential of Moscow-Delhi relations is all the more significant, as the content of their bilateral cooperation becomes richer. The present meetings in Delhi have also made it possible to take major new steps in this sphere, which is evidenced by the signing of a number of important intergovernmental agreements. The change-over from what was primarily an exchange of goods to production cooperation, to the setting up of joint enterprises, the joint working up of advanced technologies, and the development of new sources of energy—these and other steps impart a new quality to our cooperation and allow it to be raised to a new and higher stage.

The meetings and talks in Delhi demonstrated yet again and quite convincingly how two great countries can work together on the basis of trust for the benefit of themselves and the world as a whole. These meetings and talks inspire the conviction that the noble ideas contained in the Delhi Declaration will ever more surely make progress in the international arena in the future, too.

Kornilov on Afghan Statement

LD2111171388 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

"The Soviet Union and India reiterate their support for the Geneva accords on Afghanistan and call for their strict and sincere implementation by all parties concerned. The two countries deplore the obstructionist policy of certain forces which are violating the accords. They express concern over the continued bloodshed in Afghanistan and affirm that the process of national reconciliation should be encouraged. The Soviet Union and India appeal to the U.N. secretary-general to implement without delay the mandate given to him by the United Nations General Assembly resolution on Afghanistan which emphasizes the need for an intra-Afghan dialogue for the establishment of a broad-based government". These are the lines from the Soviet-Indian summit statement just adopted in Delhi. This is a call which should be heeded, a warning which should not be ignored. This is how the mass media of various countries comment on the stand of Moscow and Delhi.

This is so, indeed. The Soviet Union and India, representing a fifth part of humanity made a call to all the parties involved in the Afghan conflict to return to the positions of reason, to stop crude violation of the commitments assumed under the "Geneva package".

The "Afghan part" of the Soviet-Indian statement is a warning. It is quite apparent that it is an impossible situation when one side strictly adheres to the accords reached in Geneva, while the other grossly and brazenly flouts them.

And precisely this situation arose now, which causes quite justifiable and mounting anxiety of the international public. In this connection it is quite appropriate to recall large-scale deliveries of armaments by Pakistan and the USA to the Peshawar armed opposition which makes no secret of its intention to usurp power, the Islamabad-Washington patronage of the self-styled "Afghan Government" which got entrenched in Peshawar, the encouragement and instigation of terrorists who shell peaceful quarters of Kabul with rockets, who fire

Stinger rockets at civilian airliners. Is there need for any more proof that definite circles in Pakistan and the USA view the "Geneva package" as a meaningless scrap of paper?

This line surely has a definite political and military-strategic aim. This is written by numerous mass media now. Despite the fact that there are tendencies for detente in various areas of U.S.-Soviet relations, Washington has its own plans as regards the Soviet Union's "soft underbelly", the Soviet Central Asian republics. THE TIMES of India writes this in the issue of November 17 in its commentary on the U.S. "Afghan policy". This pronouncement cannot but attract attention. Is it that representatives of definite circles of the USA whom TIMES of India, without mincing words, describes as hawks, really intend to reanimate their old and, it would seem, long since buried idea about the possibility of creating along the USSR's southern borders a sort of anti-Soviet place d'armes controlled from Washington by means of "Islamabad levers"? One way or another, Pakistan's and the United States' actions produce a distinct impression that they would like to compel Afghanistan and the USSR to abandon the Geneva accords, even though heavy consequences of this are more than evident.

The Soviet-Indian statement which emphasizes the importance of preserving Afghanistan's sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and nonalignment is another weighty evidence of the resolve of peaceful nations to ensure a comprehensive settlement, to normalise the situation in the region. Will the circles which actually oppose the settlement now heed the calls and warnings that sounded in Delhi? The answer will come shortly. But if outside interference in the affairs of the sovereign republic continues, it is the instigators of this interference that will bear the entire responsibility for the results of this reckless, if not adventurist, policy...

Gandhi Award Ceremony Speech

PM2211094188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 88 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in New Delhi on the presentation of the Indira Gandhi Prize to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev under the general heading: "Presentation of Indira Gandhi Prize"; "Speech by R. Gandhi"]

[Text] President Gorbachev. Mr President. Mr Vice President. Excellencies. Ladies and gentlemen. Friends. We are honored to have once again in our midst for the second time in 2 years a trusted friend of India, the great leader of a great nation, of a great nation and a friendly people, an outstanding world statesman.

Gathered here today, Mr President, are Indians from all walks of life to salute you for the contribution you have made for peace, disarmament, and development.

The bold and imaginative lead which you have given has opened for the first time since the invention of nuclear weapons the possibility of sustained peace in the world. For the first time in 4 decades those armed with nuclear weapons are beginning to look for an alternative to the balance of nuclear terror. We have witnessed the dismantling of an entire nuclear weapon system. Ahead lies the prospects of a significant cut in strategic arms. The logical conclusion of the road you have embarked upon is the elimination of nuclear weapons accompanied by general and complete disarmament. Beyond that, we look to a new world order.

Through the Delhi Declaration of 2 years ago, you affirmed your commitment to the path of nonviolence. We are therefore confident of your cooperation in building the new world order on the basis of nonviolence and the principles of peaceful coexistence. The new world order which we look to would be fashioned of the dreams of Indira Gandhi. She saw all of humanity as one, and all the world as one. In her immortal words: "Our world is small, but has room for all of us to live together in peace and beauty and to improve the quality of the lives of the men and women of all races and creed."

On behalf of the government and the people of India and on my own behalf I extend to you our warmest felicitations on being a most worthy recipient of this year's Indira Gandhi prize at this historic moment when the names of Indira Gandhi and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev are joined together in the name of peace, disarmament, and development. Our mind goes back to the historic treaty of peace, friendship, and cooperation which Indira Gandhi concluded with the Soviet Union in August 1971 at a crucial moment in our history.

The Soviet Union assisted us in our industrial development at a time when others were attempting to shake our confidence in our capacity to become self-reliant. New forms of trade were devised which have led to the Soviet Union becoming one of our most important trading partner. Innovations in cultural exchanges and scientific cooperation have drawn our people close together. We thank the Soviet Union for having proved a tried and trusted friend.

As you have done in the Soviet Union, we too in India are responding to changing challenges and evolving circumstances. The minds cannot remain imprisoned in the imperatives of the past. We are firm on principles and consistent in policies but flexible and innovative in responding to new developments. Our commitment is to the eradication of poverty. That goal we are pursuing with single-minded purposefulness.

For more than 3 decades, India and the Soviet Union have enjoyed a close relationship. Today, we can justly claim that much of the new thinking about disarmament and the new world order derives from the relationship between India and the Soviet Union. We have been an

example for all the world of peaceful coexistence at its best, of two different socioeconomic systems working in close cooperation on the basis of equality, mutual understanding, and mutual trust.

Indo-Soviet friendship has benefited millions and harms none. It is a relationship built by the people of the two countries over decades. It is a demonstration of what can be achieved through goodwill, mutual respect, and mutual trust.

The Delhi Declaration has placed our bilateral relationship in a larger global context. It signals the joint endeavors of our two countries to work together and with others toward world peace and world cooperation. Its historic significance lies in the message it gives to the world of our vision, of the world we seek.

We appreciate the constructive role being played by the Soviet Union under the dynamic leadership of President Gorbachev for the defusion of confrontation, tension, and conflicts around the world. The world needs a comprehensive system of global security which enables all to live in peace, equality, and mutual respect. We look forward to working with the Soviet Union and the international community in general in devising a new system. The task before us extends well beyond economic development, peace, and security. The advance of science and technology has placed in our grasp the possibility of material growth for all, abolishing the specter of poverty, opening the doors of opportunity for all.

But science and technology cannot give us the values required to ensure for our people a fulfilling life as individuals or a fulfilling role for ourselves as a nation. It is when science fuses with spirituality that fulfillment arises. Mere material prosperity will give no satisfaction if it is divorced from the basic values which have sustained our civilization over thousands of years. Equally, spirituality alone to the detriment of a search for solutions to poverty would be tantamount to cruelty and neglect.

President Gorbachev and his people can reach back into their history to search out the basic truth which has resulted in the evolution of the great nations and the great cultures that the Soviet Union represents. We for our part can also reach back into our traditions as the representatives of the only civilization in the world to combine both antiquity and continuity with the celebration of diversity. It is from these enduring reserves of our national memory that we will retrieve the fundamental values which will take forward our respective civilizations, indeed the civilization of the world. The values which I talked of are truth and nonviolence, tolerance and compassion, and appreciation of the unity of the human family, a recognition of the oneness of the world we share.

The new world order we seek will be differentiated from the present one less by the indices of prosperity and strength than by its being anchored in the mental attitudes and value systems which alone can assure sustained peace and sustainable development.

Mr President, the world reposes great hope in you. You have shown within your country how dynamic change can be linked to fidelity to first principles. Glasnost and perestroika have entered the vocabulary of all nations. In taking your country out of obsolete grooves you have taken the world itself out of conventional ruts of thought. Rarely has it been given to one man to foster so much new thinking, so many new ideas so fresh and innovative in approach to human affairs. The worldwide revolution in thinking which you have provoked also places upon your shoulders a heavy responsibility.

Each element of the new world order we seek is as important as the other. The elements together constitute an integral whole. They must be put together comprehensively. Partial solutions might make international relations even more difficult and dangerous than they are at present. Hence, the responsibility which devolves on you of carrying forward to its logical conclusion the processes which you have started.

We need a world which respects the sovereign democratic equality of all nations, however large or small, whatever their differences might be in military or economic strength. What the world needs is a recognition of interdependence where depravation in any one segment is seen as a loss to all and where prosperity is shared, because the sharing of prosperity increases prosperity all around.

We need a world which totally abjures the twin evils of racism and colonialism. We need a world where the environment is conserved, the ecological balance is protected, and pollution forestalled or quickly rectified. We need cooperation and coexistence. We need an end to the aggression, death, and destruction engendered by the concept of deterrence.

India and the Soviet Union have worked together to show the world this way. We look forward to continuing our march as companions in a common journey, as friends of old standing treasuring their friendship. It is sometimes argued that the dissolution of bloc politics, which you, Mr President, have put on the agenda of the international community, has rendered nonalignment obsolete. On the contrary, nonalignment has rarely been more relevent than it is at this juncture , because as the world begins to see things our way, we must remain on hand to participate in the reordering of the world order so that the new order accords with our principles, our policies and our priorities.

If you will permit me a moment of personal sentiments, I feel the presence of my mother Indira Gandhi looking over us now. From the letters which my grandfather

Jawahar Lal Nehru wrote to her from prison, she learned of the Great October Revolution and the profound changes that the revolution had ushered in, not only in your country, but the world over. She accompanied her father to the Soviet Union on his historic journey there in 1955 as prime minister of free India. As prime minister herself she nurtured with loving care the tender plant of India-Soviet friendship. That plant has now been handed over to our care.

You, Mr President, came to be the chosen leader of the Soviet Union at just about the same time as I was elected prime minister. Together we have carried forward the great tradition of our mutual friendship. Never more intensively than in the last 3 years have high-level exchanges between our countries reached the pitch attained in recent times. Never before has there been such diversity and such a wide range in contacts between our two countries. Never before have the Soviet people witnessed such a broad spectrum of the culture of India.

Never before have the people of India seen so much of your ways of life. You and I can affirm with pride that we have been true to our forebears who made friendship between India and the Soviet Union a vital element in the national life of each country and the vital component of international relations. Likewise, our friendship has continued to provide a new and hopeful dimension to world peace and global cooperation.

In honoring you, we honor also the memory of India Gandhi, a great architect of our friendship, a statesperson without fear, whose contribution to peace, disarmament, and development has become part of the contemporary history of human kind. We welcome you to India and thank you for accepting this token of our appreciation.

Venkataraman Speech at Ceremony

PM2111173188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 88 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by Indian President R. Venkataraman on 19 November under the general heading: "Presentation of Indira Gandhi Prize"]

[Text] Your Excellency, President Gorbachev!

Esteemed guests!

It is a great honor and privilege for me to present the Indira Gandhi Peace Prize to the most eminent statesman of our time, His Excellency Mikhail Gorbachev. This prize for peace, disarmament, and development was instituted in memory of Indira Gandhi, who made persistent efforts all her life to rid the world of nuclear weapons. Awarding the prize this year to President Gorbachev reflects proper recognition of the historic contribution he has made to creating a safer, more reasonable world.

Indira Gandhi was an outstanding personality. I had the honor to know her well and work in close cooperation with her.

Indira Gandhi's concern for the weak and oppressed is well known. In our own country she was concerned with minorities, the destitute, and the ill-fated. She took a whole series of measures to improve their living conditions. This concern of hers was not limited to narrow Indian state boundaries—it extended to the rest of the world as well. Her courageous struggle against apartheid in the RSA and for the freedom and independence of Namibia found a response in the United Nations, the Commonwealth, and the Nonaligned Movement.

No less passionate was her "crusade" against nuclear weapons, which threaten destruction not only for individual countries but for the whole world—even all civilization. Her impassioned words spoken in this hall at the conference of heads of state and government of nonaligned countries in 1983 are still ringing in my ears (and I quote):

"Every day, every hour the scale and lethal power of nuclear weapons are growing.... This cobra has reared its head. Mankind, paralyzed by fear, cannot tear its eyes away from it.... The destructive force contained in nuclear arsenals is capable of destroying all human life many times over and is also perfectly capable of preventing the birth of new life for many centuries to come."

Earlier, during a visit to the Soviet Union, a country she sincerely admired for its achievements and efforts, she said: "The search for peace requires persistent effort. Peace cannot be achieved by expectation and hope. But it can be achieved through action and tenacity. No single person can conduct an individual quest for peace. The search for peace also cannot consist in the national efforts of one country. This search must become an international goal. The day before his murder, Mahatma Gandhi said that the path to peace means living your entire life in struggle and investing all your strength in this struggle in order to overcome all difficulties. This applies to countries no less than to individual people. Dreams must be accompanied by efforts."

Since earliest times, historians have argued over what determines people's lives: The role of the personality or broader social factors. In my view, these arguments are futile. Everyone is a product of his time. His thinking and standpoint are shaped by his environment and experience. Nevertheless, a number of people appear in every age who can understand or generalize the complex phenomena surrounding us and show the way forward. Not everyone has the necessary courage, foresight, and commitment to his goal to do this. In our time you, President Gorbachev, are one of these rare beings. Aware of the terrible danger threatening mankind, you have reined in the times and proposed a whole complex of ideas and actions that could show the whole world the

way out of the impasse of conflict and violence. What you are trying to do is broader than diplomacy—it is state perspicacity; it is broader than politics—it is a whole philosophy in itself.

Mr President, you have stimulated a process of persistent reflection on the paramount tasks facing mankind and the path it should follow. We here in India share your idea of mankind's future, which is reflected in the historic Delhi Declaration on the Principles of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons and Violence. All reasonable people on earth and all peace-loving people must share this idea, which is universal and eternal.

Your support for the principles of nonviolence has evoked a particular response in the hearts of the people of India—the land of Buddha and Mahatma Gandhi. Twenty-five centuries ago Buddha proclaimed that nonviolence is indeed the most fundamental truth of all: "Ahimsa parmo dharma." He taught that nonviolence and compassion are the only answer to the pain and burden of life. In our time, Mahatma Gandhi turned nonviolence into the most powerful political weapon in the struggle against conflicts and clashes within societies and between countries. In his study of history he perceived the inexorable effect of the Ahimsa in turning man from a hunter and a cannibal into a builder of societies and systems. Mahatma Gandhi concluded that "the world of the future must be a society based on nonviolence."

On the eve of World War II he wrote:

"One thing is clear: If senseless calls to arm continue, it will certainly lead to the destruction of human life on a scale unprecedented in history. And if someone does emerge the victor from this, this very victory will be death personified for the country that is the victor. There is no escape from looming catastrophe other than bold, unconditional recognition of nonviolent methods with all their glorious consequences."

Just the other day a friend of mine reminded me of how Mahatma Gandhi reacted to the news of the events in Nagasaki and Hiroshima. He closed his eyes for some time, then said in an infinitely gentle voice that now he was convinced more than ever of the inevitability of nonviolence.

Heir to a great land and a worthy people which has made such an enormous contribution to the development of mankind's thinking and achievements, you, Mr President, have captured the imagination of peace-loving people throughout the world. What you have done in an amazingly short space of time is evidence of your sincerity and dynamism.

A new ray of hope has appeared in your own country—thanks to your bold domestic policies—and throughout the world—thanks to your creative initiatives in disarmament and cooperation. The world will evidently still remain divided into political camps, but efforts by statesmen such as Jawahar Lal Nehru, Indira Gandhi, and yourself create a united camp of peace embracing all nations and overcoming ideological boundaries and longstanding prejudice. In deciding to award you the Indira Gandhi Prize the international jury has merely confirmed the universal admiration of your valiant efforts in the sphere of nuclear disarmament and universal peace.

Esteemed guests, in presenting this prize to President Gorbachev we not only recognize his tireless, persistent efforts to attain these goals—we also express our full support for his bold initiatives and actions.

So, may success attend his efforts and may they bring blessed peace to our good earth!

Gorbachev's 'Perestroyka' Published in Hindi

LD1511102388 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 14 Nov 88

[Text] New Delhi November 14 TASS—A ceremony marking the publication in the Hindi language of Mikhail Gorbachev's book "Perestroyka: New Thinking for Our Country and the World" has been held in the Indian capital.

As noted by several prominent Indian political and public leaders, who took the floor during the ceremony, this book by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has become a best-seller throughout the world. It is in great demand in India, too. This book, first put out in the English language, was sold out in practically no time. Those who were lucky to get hold of it were asked to pass it on to their friends. Today the book on perestroyka in the Soviet Union, brought out in mass edition, is accessible to the Indian readership at large. It has already been put out in the Tamil, Hindi, Telugu, Malayalam, Kannada, Gujarati, Marathi, Punjabi, Bengali and Assamese languages.

"Thanks to Mikhail Gorbachev's book, the word 'perestroyka', as the term 'sputnik', has become part and parcel of all the languages of the world", it was stated at the ceremony by P.S. Joshi, professor of the Economic Development Institute of Delhi University. "We resort to it when speaking about revolutionary changes in social life, tapping human potential and in dealing with renovation processes. Perestroyka smashes mental stereotypes. It has altered utterly the Soviet Union's image which was current in several Western states, has stripped the opponents of socialism of all their trump-cards.

The speakers noted that it was not without reason that Mikhail Gorbachev's book was put out on the eve of his visit to India. This, they stressed, is tribute of profound respect which the Indian people entertain for the Soviet leader, proof of the great interest they have for the radical changes occurring in the Soviet Union.

Deputy Defense Minister Visits Algeria

PM2111093188 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Nov 88 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "On Official Visit"]

[Text] In accordance with an agreement already reached, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, will pay an official friendly visit to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria during the last 10 days of November.

Arrives in Algiers 21 Nov

LD2111142988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1340 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Algiers, 21 Nov (TASS)—Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, arrived in Algiers today on an official friendly visit in accordance with an agreement.

At the international airport he was met by General Kh. Nezzar, chief of staff and commanders of the National People's Army of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, and other officials.

USSR Ambassador to Algeria V.N. Taratutu was in the welcoming party.

Received by Bendjedid

LD2111192688 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Algiers November 21 TASS—President Chadli Bendjedid of Algeria has received Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev. They had a conversation on issues of mutual interest.

Marshal Akhromeyev held talks with General Khaled Nezzar. They examined the present state of Soviet-Algerian military cooperation and ways of its further development and consolidation.

PRAVDA Cites Najibullah's 21 Nov Speech

PM2211114588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Najibullah Speech"]

[Text] Kabul, 21 Nov (TASS)—The observance of the Geneva agreements by all signatory parties is the pivotal issue of ensuring peace in Afghanistan, President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan, said Sunday.

Addressing the final meeting of the second session of Afghanistan's National Council (parliament), he noted that Afghanistan and the USSR abided by the letter and the spirit of Geneva and the withdrawal of 50 percent of Soviet troops from the country furnished proof of this.

At the same time, Pakistan and the United States consider, to all appearances, that the agreements boil down to the withdrawal of the Soviet military contingent only. The Pakistani authorities go ahead with and increase interference which escalates into acts of armed aggression in some areas of Afghanistan.

Due to support from abroad formations of the diehard opposition, which temporarily control some border areas left by the Afghan troops, launched bloody terror against the civilian population. The examples of this are the developments in Konduz, Takhar, Kunar, Bamian, and other areas. Extremists held sway in Vardak for one night only but during this time they destroyed what people built for years, Najibullah noted.

The scheme of the Pakistani military and its allies is seen: In supplying thier wards with everything necessary for acts of aggression, they hope to turn Afghanistan after the withdrawal of Soviet troops into a military base posing a threat to other countries. In this connection the suspension of the withdrawal cannot be viewed other than the warning to the extremists, the invitation to honour the Geneva agreements. The current situation, which was forced on us by the armed opposition, which enjoys the backing of Pakistan and the United States, does not make it possible to withdraw Soviet troops, the president went on.

Political quarters in the West, Najibullah declared, launched a clamorous campaign over the equipment of the Afghan Army with modern weapons, seeing this as a violation of the Geneva accords. Meanwhile, our Armed forces which defend the independence and sovereignty of the state have every right to enhance their fighting efficiency by acquiring new military equipment. As long as the enemy forces on us the escalation of the war, we are compelled and are duty bound to take measures to defend the homeland, the Afghan leader stressed. He spoke highly of the morale and combat readiness of the country's Armed Forces, assuring the parliamentarians that the Army would be able to give a befitting rebuff to the extremists. This is confirmed by the latest developments in Qandahar and Nangarhar where a due lesson was given to the diehard opposition.

The situation in those provinces cannot, however, be regarded separately from the general elections held in Pakistan, the president said. There is no doubt that by stepping up combat operations in Afghan border areas, extremists tried to influence the balloting, solidifying the militarist quarters' positions, or to thwart them altogether under the pretext of the exacerbation of the situation on the border. Mindful of these circumstances, the Afghan Army displayed maximum restraint and patience during its stay near the border.

Najibullah drew the attention of the National Council for one more time to the Afghan leadership's peace initiatives. He stressed that on the agenda now was the

issue not of the existence of a separate party, organization or group but of the life of the whole of the Afghan people. Each Afghan should apply every effort to attain peace: this is a common responsibility and common task.

RSFSR Transport Minister Meets Najibullah

LD2111002988 Moscow TASS in English 1643 GMT 20 Nov 88

[Text] Kabul November 20 TASS—President Najibullah of Afghanistan today received Yuriy Sukhin, minister of automobile transport of the Russian Federation. During the meeting the Afghan leader spoke highly of the work of the seventh session of the Soviet-Afghan Joint Commission on Transport, saying that its results would make a contribution to the development of this branch of the national economy.

The president noted that the Afghan people witnessed the USSR's increased fraternal assistance in a variety of areas.

Afghanistan Protests to U.S. Over 'Interference'

LD2111131688 Moscow TASS in English 0720 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Kabul November 21 TASS—State security bodies of the Republic of Afghanistan arrested recently three Afghans who engaged in espionage activities for the USA. In this connection, BAKHTAR news agency reports, the U.S. charge d'affaires ad interim in Afghanistan was summoned to the Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan to hear protest against U.S. interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan.

TASS Summarizes Successful Troop Operations

LD2011111288 Moscow TASS in English 1009 GMT 20 Nov 88

[Text] Kabul November 20 TASS—Government troops in Afghanistan have inflicted the heaviest losses on armed opposition gangs in Qandahar, Nangarhar and Paktia Provinces during continuing operations to eliminate the rebels.

BAKHTAR News Agency estimates that between 300 and 400 extremists were killed.

A foreign adviser whose citizenship is not yet known was killed in the vicinity of Gardeyz.

Two Arab military instructors, 13 Pakistani servicemen and 77 Afghan rebels were killed by rockets fired by government forces at an opposition base in the area of Shopuli.

According to incomplete data, eleven recoilless guns, 20 mortars and large amounts of other weapons were destroyed.

Air and artillery strikes at rebel groups in Paktia and Farah Provinces put some 150 extremists out of action.

A high-yield plastic bomb exploded outside a house near the 'Friendship' school in a densely-populated are of Kabul this morning. This act of terrorism killed two people.

Anti-government groups rocketed the city of Gardeyz once again, wounding two civilians. Jalalabad, capital of Nangarhar Province, also came under rocket attack.

American journalist Karen Ombecker [name as received] was killed in Seyyed Karam District in Paktia Province several days ago after illegally crossing the border into Afghanistan with an armed opposition group. The circumstances of her death are still unknown. The extremists accompanying her took her body to Pakistan.

In view of continuing Pakistani violations of the Geneva agreements, the Afghan Foreign Ministry handed the U.N. mission here the 124th note on further shipments of arms and ammunition to Afghanistan for the die-hard opposition.

The senate of the national council (parliament) of Afghanistan urged the commanders and rank-and-file members of armed groups to stop the war which has continued for many years.

In its appeal the Senate called attention to the numerous casualties and wide-spread destruction resulting from the war. It stressed that only the Afghans themselves can restore peace to their land.

"Afghanistan is at a critical point and everybody holding it dear must embark on the path of talks and mutual understanding," the Senate said.

Afghan President Najibullah received a group of Senators here. Speaking of the military-political situation in the country, he called on the members of parliament to join in the national reconciliation effort more actively.

The coordinating council of the bloc of democratic left parties said in a resolution passed at a meeting here that it is essential to convene an international conference for demilitarizing Afghanistan.

It will not only help deliver the country from arms but also offer a guarantee for its territorial integrity and national independence, give the Afghan people democratic rights and liberties and assist economic rehabilitation, the resolution said.

It urged all sides concerned to hold talks for creating a most broadly-representative coalition government and help achieve a ceasefire and convene a peace jirgah (assembly).

IZVESTIYA Reports on Pakistan Poll Situation

PM2111111588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 1

["IZVESTIYA Press Service" report: "Pakistan: The Rivals Have Not Laid Down Their Arms"]

[Text] President Ghulam Ishaq Khan of Pakistan announced that he would appoint a prime minister after the announcement of the results of today's (Saturday) elections to legislative assemblies in all of the country's four provinces.

For the second time this week Pakistani voters will have to choose between candidates of the government-backed Islamic Democratic Alliance [IDA] and the Pakistan People's Party [PPP] which gained victory at the general elections. According to UPI, PPP leader Benazir Bhutto, speaking at a news conference in Karachi, declared that a sufficient number of deputies elected to the National Assembly have joined the PPP, giving it the required majority. "We expect the president to call on us, as soon as possible and before the parliamentary session is convened, to form the new government," Benazir Bhutto declared.

According to news agency reports, Nawaz Sharif, one of the IDA leaders and chief minister of Pakistan's Punjab Province, has also declared his readiness to form his own government based on support by the required number of National Assembly deputies from "spiritually close and independent parties." But the news agencies note, citing political observers in Pakistan, that such statements by the IDA leader should, in all probability, be perceived as an attempt to exert pressure on voters during the provincial election campaign.

Yahya Bakhtiar, former general prosecutor of Pakistan and currently Benazir Bhutto's adviser on constitutional issues, issued a warning that any denial of the PPP's right to form the new government is fraught with the threat of mass disturbances in the country, UPI reports.

Assessing the prospects for the development of the domestic political situation in the country, Britain's THE GUARDIAN notes that the odds seem to be heavily in favor of B. Bhutto. First, the newspaper writes, she received backing from the Pakistani Army's commander in chief, and second she is more than likely to gain victory at the elections of provincial legislative assemblies since voters give preference to the side "that looks like a winner."

TASS Notes Pakistani Polling 'Peaceful'

LD1911165888 Moscow TASS in English 1628 GMT 19 Nov 88

[Text] Islamabad November 19 TASS—Voting at election to the legislative assemblies of four provinces of Pakistan—Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan, and the North Western Frontier Province—is over.

The local news agency APP has reported that the polling, just as the November 16 election to the national assembly took place in a peaceful and calm atmosphere. The seats in the provincial assembly were contested mainly by the candidates of the Pakistan People's Party and the Islamic Democratic Alliance.

At the same time the parties which have influence in individual provinces took an active part in the polling: the Pakistan National Party, the Baluchi National Alliance, the National People's Party, and Jamiat-ul-Ulema-e-Islam. Independent candidates constituted the largest group of contender for seats in the provincial assemblies.

The counting of votes is now in progress.

Egypt's Recognition of Palestinian State Viewed

LD2211000788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Igor Surguchev commentary]

[Text] Almost 40 states, including the Soviet Union and the PRC and permanent members of the UN Security Council, have to date recognized the independent Palestinian state proclaimed less than a week ago by the Palestinian National Council, the supreme legislative body of the Palestinian people. A spokesman for the Arab Republic of Egypt's Government has announced the official recognition of this state in Cairo. At the microphone is Igor Surguchev with a news commentary.

[Surguchev] Egypt's decision, in particular, merits further attention. The fact is that Tel Aviv and Washington were banking precisely on the stance of this Arab country, a partner of Israel and the United States in the Camp David deal, in their plans to halt or subdue the wave of international recognition of the Palestinian state. However, they have lost their gamble. The fetters of the anti-Arab Camp David accords have proved too weak to restrain Cairo from expressing total and unconditional support for the just struggle of the Palestinian people, a struggle to which the decisions of the PNC session in Algiers and in particular the proclamation of the Palestinian state, give fresh and powerful stimulus.

By officially recognizing this state, Egypt has struck a serious blow against the Camp David deal, which envisages only a curtailed autonomy for the Palestinians on the lands occupied by Israel. The current Egyptian leadership, which inherited Camp David from the former Al-Sadat regime, has not been moved by the desperate appeals from Tel Aviv to adhere to the provisions of the trilateral accords on the Palestinian issue. By the same token, Cairo has undoubtedly made a contribution to the strengthening of pan-Arab unity, and has unambiguously shown that the process of its retreat from the Camp David deal which began when President Mubarak came to power is continuing.

In PLO circles, much attention is being attached to Egypt's positive step, and they believe it will have a substantial influence on other countries that are wavering for the time being concerning recognition of the independent Palestinian state. But however important Egypt's stand may be, the main factor in favor of broad international recognition of an Arab Palestine is the constructive character of the political declaration adopted by the Palestinian National Council, which stresses a peaceful, political settlement of the Middle East crisis on the basis of the well-known UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. The Palestinians have convincingly demonstrated to the whole world their readiness for such a settlement, taking account of Israel's national interests, and the legitimacy from the point of view of international law of their struggle for the formation of their own state, with a capital in Jerusalem, on the West Bank of the Jordan and on the Gaza Strip.

One cannot fail to agree with the words of King Husayn of Jordan in an interview for U.S. CBS television, that the Palestinians have gone as far as possible under conditions where Israel's position has not changed in the slightest. Indeed, it is now clearer than ever before to the world public that it is only the stubborn refusal, devoid of any grounds, by Tel Aviv and Washington to recognize the PLO and the rights of the Palestinians to statehood that is blocking the way to a just settlement of the Palestinian problem, which is the key to an all-embracing peace settlement in the Middle East. Now is the time for the United States and Israel to respond with their own steps toward peace in the region.

Recognition of Palestinian State Broadens

LD2111150988 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—By a TASS diplomatic correspondent:

New and new countries from various continents state their recognition for the independent Palestinian state proclaimed at an extraordinary session of the Palestine National Council (PNC) in Algiers. For example, an Egyptian spokesman said in Cairo on Sunday that Egypt considered the recognition of the Palestinian state to be in force from November 15 this year, i.e. since the moment of its proclamation. China announced today it recognised the Palestinian state. Thus some 40 countries have already officially supported the important resolution of the PNC, for which the Arab people of Palestine worked purposefully during many years.

The USSR was the first permanent member of the U.N. Security Council to recognise the Palestinian state. The position of the Soviet Union is known: The decisions of the PNC extraordinary session in Algiers are an important contribution to the process of just political settlement in the Middle East.

A situation is emerging at present when all sides involved in the conflict proceed from the recognition that a way to peace and peaceful coexistence between Arabs and Israel lies through talks on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338 of the Security Council, from the equal right of Jewish and Arab states to exist in Palestine. Another important consideration is that the supreme representative body of the Palestinian people declared its adherence to the generally recognised principles of international contacts.

King Husayn was quoted as saying on Sunday in a CBS interview that the decisions taken by the PNC in Algiers represented exactly what the USA demanded from the PLO as a condition for its participation in an international conference on the Middle East. It would seem that the way is now open for the settlement. However, the position of Israel and the United States on holding the peace conference has not changed. Ehud Olmert, one of the leading aides of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir, categorically rejected in an ABC programme the possibility of PLO participation in talks with Israel. It is obvious that such a short-sighted position of Tel Aviv largely contributed to Israel's international isolation.

It is believed in the Soviet Union that it is necessary to step up efforts to convene the peace conference as soon as possible. It is important not to miss the chance, to start practical work aimed at establishing a lasting peace in the Middle East, which will result in the people of Palestine receiving their homeland, the people of Israel reliable security, the region as a whole and the international community getting rid of one of the most dangerous flash-points of tension.

Bessmertnykh Cited on Palestinian State

LD1811165788 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 18 Nov 88

[Excerpts] At a briefing held in Moscow on 18 November, the first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, announced that the Soviet Union has recognised the just proclaimed Palestinian state. [passage omitted]

The journalists present at the briefing put a number of questions to him. One question was whether the situation in the Middle East would be discussed in connection with the new factor that emerged recently, the proclamation of the Palestinian state, during the visit of the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, to India, the United States, and Britain.

Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said: We proceed from the assumption that the decisions of the National Council of Palestine are a major step allowing the insurance of more favorable conditions for resolving the situation in the Middle East. Naturally, the first deputy foreign minister said, we are interested in maintaining contacts and having dialogue with all the countries. There is no doubt that all these questions will figure on the agenda of our

immediate talks with the leaderships of the countries which we are going to have contacts with in the near future, that is, with the United States, Britain, and India, said Aleksandr Bessmertnykh.

He was also asked if the proclamation of the Palestinian state can complicate the preparations of a conference on the Middle East, especially in view of the fact that East Jerusalem was named as the new state's capital.

Aleksandr Bessmertnykh underlined in his reply that the statement about the proclamation of a state is a very serious step on the part of the Palestinian leadership, confirming that it's a serious partner for future talks, both at the time of the preparation of an international conference and at such time it is held. Besides the Palestinians made it plain that they recognize the right to the existence of two states—the Jewish, that is Israel, and the Arab state on the territory of Palestine. Until recently, the position of the Palestinians on this issue was not clear. The Palestinian leadership also reaffirmed that it rejects any forms of terrorism, including state-sponsored. All this actually removes all claims that were addressed artificially to the Palestine Liberation Organization when the question was discussed whether the organization should represent the interests of Palestinians at an international conference or not. I think, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said, all this makes conditions for holding of a conference on a Middle East settlement more favorable.

As far as the proclamation of the capital is concerned, this isn't a simple question, the Soviet official went on, but it's important that involved in the matter is the eastern part of Jerusalem known as the Arab part of the city. I think this question will be decided within the framework of the entire Middle East settlement issue, said the first deputy foreign minister of the USSR.

Situation of Palestinians in Beirut Viewed

LD2111054088 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Nov 88

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Excerpts] [Kondrashov] Now to an event full of hope and tragedy. On the night of Tuesday, 15 November, Yasir 'Arafat on behalf of the Palestine National Council proclaimed the creation of the independent Palestinian state. [passage omitted] Rostovtsev reports from Beirut about the situation of the Palestinians:

[Rostovtsev] [passage omitted] [video shows Mar Ilyas and Burj al-Barajinah refugee camp] Burj al-Barajinah: another Palestinian refugee camp in Beirut. Before, 40,000 people lived here. Now there are half as many. One of the main reasons is the lack of unity and agreement in the Palestinian movement. These ruins show strikingly what internal feuding sometimes results in. Burj al-Barajinah is one of those places where even very recently hostile Palestinian groups were trying to clarify their relations with the help of weapons.

Those who returned and those who stayed: that is what they are called here. Those who stayed are the Palestinians who stayed in Lebanon after the withdrawal of all the PLO armed units from Beirut when it was beseiged by the Israeli aggressors in 1982. And those who returned are the members of the armed groups that are reestablishing themselves in Lebanon, risking another Israeli attack on the Palestinians.

There are other lines along which the conflict is developing. It is shown in the opposing approaches to cooperation with Lebanese political forces. This is also a serious problem hindering the unity of the Palestinian movement.

The Lebanese have differing attitudes toward the Palestinians. Most of them understand their unfortunate situation and try to ease it. But there are others who tend to blame the Palestinians for their own misfortunes, first and foremost that it was allegedly they who provoked the violence wreaked by the Zionists on Lebanon during the last attack, and the current machinations of Tel Aviv as well. [passage omitted]

[Kondrashov] Well, indeed, justice should triumph, but alas, such things do not happen by themselves. It must triumph by way of the unity of the Palestinians, which will give them strength, by way of the solidarity of other peoples with their cause, and finally by way of realism on both sides—both the Palestinians and the Israelis. The latter must realize that it really is better to live with good neighbors than to sit on a powder keg in a beseiged fortress.

TASS on Soviet-Palestinian Trade Union Talks

LD2011163188 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0920 GMT 19 Nov 88

[Text] Tunis, 19 Nov (TASS)—A statement for the press adopted on the results of the visit to Tunis at the invitation of the Federation of Palestine Trade Unions (FPTU) by a Soviet trade union led by B.A. Averyanov, chief of the AUCCTU International Department, was distributed here.

The document says that the delegation was received by Y. 'Arafat, PLO Executive Committee chairman, who briefed them on the results of the PNC session in Algiers concerning the proclamation of an independnet Palestinian state.

The Soviet delegation had meetings with F. Qadummi, chief of the PLO's political department, H. Ibrahim, FPTU secretary general [title as received], and other leaders of the federation. The talks concerned the further development of cooperation between Palestinian and Soviet trade unions.

Libya Denies U.S. Charge on Chemical Weapons
LD1811024388 Moscow TASS in English 2356 GMT 17 Nov 88

[Text] New York November 18 TASS—Libya has refuted the U.S. Administration's fabrications that it plans to produce and acquire chemical weapons.

The letter by Jadallah 'Azuz al-Talhi, secretary of the Supreme People's Committee of the People's Bureau for External Relations of Libya, addressed to U.N. secretary-general was released at the U.N. headquarters today as a document of the General Assembly and Security Council.

The letter says that Libya categorically refutes these fabrications and does not have an intention to produce any type of chemical weapons. Al-Talhi drew the attention of the international community to the danger posed by this slanderous campaign which aims at damaging Libya's reputation and trumping up a pretext for one more attack on it.

He underscored the Libyan Government's readiness to participate in any international efforts aimed at banning the production, stockpiling and use of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

East Europe

Book Published on Gorbachev Meeting With Poles
PM1811152988 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 15 Nov 88 p 2

[Article by Yu. Borisov: "Philosophy of Pluralism"]

[Text] The anthology "The Intelligentsia Faced With the New Problems of Socialism," which has just been published by the Political Literature Publishing House, followed from the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and Polish cultural and scientific figures. The meeting took place in Warsaw last July.

We remember so many of these meetings between political leaders and the intelligentsia, the artists and scientists heard so many wise exhortations and useful advice, and so many sober warnings were sounded! As for shouts and calls for attention, everything went well there, too.

"Until quite recently here, when people spoke about unorthodox thinking [inakomysliye] they immediately asked: Isn't it time to end this? After all, unorthodox thinking simply means thinking differently [inaya mysl]."

M.S. Gorbachev said that during the meeting, and in so doing showed not only that the present situation in our society is different from the decades of silent like-mindedness but also showed himself to be a man who knows the value of someone else's opinion. Here is how the quote continues: "But there must always be different thinking during the discussion of great problems, great questions, serious questions, and new questions.... Unorthodox thinking, as long as it is different thinking and not political speculation (which also happens), is the engine of spiritual and scientific and technical progress."

Unorthodox thinking in the positive sense also featured at that meeting. Scientists, writers, theater and cinema people, and church representatives expressed the most diverse views on the new problems that socialism now faces.

It must be said that this was a serious, trenchant, and sincere discussion. Here are some of the questions put to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

"Do you not think that Marxists today should be more resolute in their opposition to certain obsolete dogmas, and above all to the concept of the unambiguous definition of the superstructure of the socioeconomic basis, in the way that it has often been interpreted?" (Professor L. Kuczynski).

"Do you not think...that in light of the Polish experience it is necessary to completely reject Marx' concept of religion as the opiate of the masses?" (Kuczynski).

"For many people in Poland the Brezhnev doctrine and its implementation 20 years ago in Czechoslovakia was an acute problem. I would like to ask: How does a politician rather than a historian look at these things today?" (journalist and historian M. Krol).

"Having read your book, Comrade General Secretary, I have realized that it is not up to me convince you that **the aims of socialism should be redefined all the time**" (S. Kwiatkowski, director of the public opinion research center).

Such diverse questions, such a liberated discussion.... But that should be no surprise any more. After all, the meeting with representatives of the Polish intelligentsia took place right after the 19th all-union party conference, which was in its way a yardstick of glasnost, democratic spirit, and pluralism of opinions.

The anthology, published by the Political Literature Publishing House, is interesting because it has a foreword written by M.S. Gorbachev. The fact is that during the meeting the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee did not have time to answer all the questions put to him or to give his point of view on some problems.

The commentary not only gives those answers, but also M.S. Gorbachev gives his thoughts on the principles of the new political thinking. When speaking about the priority of general human values and interests he recalls that the interconnection between proletarian-class and general human interests was originally established in

Marxism. The conclusion on the priority of general human values does not mark a divergence from Marxist-Leninist philosophy. This conclusion corresponds to Marxism's humanist sense.

Such is the dialectical approach we see in Mikhail Sergeyevich's discussion on religion under socialism and on the way in which the new thinking interprets freedom of conscience. This is a question not of the renunciation of materialist and consequently atheist teaching but of how to overcome certain harmful stereotypes with regard to religion and believers.

Of course Polish (and not only Polish) interlocutors will note that one of the most important ideas was the one that the most reliable basis for unity is not the unification or categorization of everything but the ability to derive useful lessons for everyone from diversity. It may be said that the new thinking is opposed to the disregarding of special national-state characteristics.

We are dealing with the same pluralism of opinions only with regard to the states of the socialist community. This approach is quite logical: Where the opinion of the individual person is respected so the ways of development of the whole state are respected.

Through diversity to unity. Through democratization and glasnost to the conscious discipline of creators. Through the personal interest of each worker to the interest of society.

Those are the paths of restructuring that M.S. Gorbachev proposes. Some people consider such views unorthodox thinking.

But this is precisely that kind of unorthodox thinking that determines the ways to renew socialism and revive Lenin's concept of socialism at the present stage.

Book Recalls Katyn Events

LD1811181088 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1105 GMT 18 Nov 88

[Leslaw Nowak report from Moscow]

[Text] A few days ago a collection of materials on Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with representatives of the world of culture and science at the Royal Castle in Warsaw was published by the Political Literature publishers. The full program of the visit means that the time allocated to that meeting turned out to be insufficient, and not everyone was able to speak. The guests did not manage to answer all the questions. The published collection, apart from replies, also contains the author's reflections about problems raised during the meeting at the castle, and a preface and an epilogue by the author. It also contains an analysis of the changes taking place in the Soviet Union.

In returning to the questions, Mikhail Gorbachev gives considered answers to them and appeals to people to be guided by historical truth in their final assessments. He points out, among other things—as he maintains—to the inevitable nature of the signing of a nonaggression pact between the USSR and Germany on 23 August 1939, if, I quote, one proceeds from firm and realistic positions. But in writing about the friendship treaty concluded between the Soviet Union and Germany a month later, on 28 September 1939, and Molotov's statement, the Soviet leader writes, I quote: We believe it was not only a political error, with heavy consequences equally for us, for other states, and for the communist movement, but was also a direct and defiant departure from Leninism.

The materials also raise the issue of the crime perpetrated against Polish officers at Katyn. Many people in Poland, the epilogue says, are convinced that it was the work of Stalin and Beriya. The history of that tragedy is at present being thoroughly researched. The results of the analyses will make it possible to conclude to what extent these or other opinions and assessments are justified. Today, in Katyn there are two monuments, side-by-side—to the Poles and to Soviet prisoners of war executed there by the Nazis. This also is a symbol of the tragedy which befell both our peoples, Mikhail Gorbachev writes.

The collection of materials is entitled "The Intelligentsia Faced With the New Problems of Socialism."

Shcherbitskiy, Czyrek Sign Cooperation Document

PM2111124188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Cooperation Program Signed"]

[Text] Kiev, 17 Nov—V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, and J. Czyrek, Politburo member and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, who is in the Ukrainian SSR at the invitation of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee at the head of a PZPR Central Committee delegation, have signed a program of cooperation between the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the PZPR Central Committee. The program is one result of the implementation of the accords reached during M.S. Gorbachev's official friendly visit to Poland.

The document envisages a regular exchange of the work experience of party organizations and state organs and the further development of economic and scientific-technical cooperation, above all by means of organizing direct links between associations, enterprises, and scientific institutions and activating border trade. Joint efforts will be made to expand cultural exchanges and

links between creative unions, trade union, youth, and other public organizations, and the mass media. The sides will promote tourist exchange and visits by citizens by private invitation.

I believe, V.V. Shcherbitskiy said, that we have the right to congratulate one another on the signing of the first and, in that sense, historic document on the establishment of cooperation between the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and PZPR Central Committee. The document and the work we will be doing to implement it will contribute to further deepening fraternal mutual relations between the CPSU and PZPR and between our countries and peoples.

Having expressed cordial gratitude for the warm and friendly reception accorded to the delegation members in the Ukraine, J. Czyrek noted that there had been a profound and very useful exchange of opinions and experience in the two parties' activity.

The document we have just signed, he said, will undoubtedly bring us to a new and higher stage in expanding and deepening links between the PZPR and CPSU, between Poland and the USSR and our fraternal countries' peoples.

Other Ukrainian Communist Party and government leaders, the members of the PZPR Central Committee delegation, and Polish Ambassador to the USSR W. Natorf attended the program signing ceremony.

Kiev Paper on Czyrek Visit

AU2111173988 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 16 Nov 88 p 3

[RATAU report: "A Meeting in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] On 15 November V.V. Shcherbitskiy, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, received a PZPR Central Committee delegation headed by J. Czyrek, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. The delegation was in the capital city of the Soviet Ukraine at the invitation of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

During a warm and comradely conversation, V.V. Shcherbitskiy gave an account of the activity of the republic's party organizations in implementing the decisions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. He tackled organizational party and ideological work under the conditions of radical reform in the economy and the political system, and the accountability and election campaign in party organizations. J. Czyrek gave a briefing on the situation in Poland, on the work carried out by the PZPR to accelerate the processes of socialist renewal and democratization in society, and on preparations for a conference of PZPR congress delegates, which is to be convened in the spring of 1989.

In the conversation, it was noted with satisfaction that, as a result of compliance with the accords reached during M.S. Gorbachev's official friendly visit to the Polish People's Republic, cooperation between the CPSU and the PZPR and between the USSR and the Polish People's Republic had further developed. In this connection the sides discussed a draft program for cooperation between the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the PZPR Central Committee, and problems concerning the establishing at various levels of constant working contacts between the Ukrainian SSR and the Polish People's Republic. It was emphasized that these contacts would be highly important for deepening Soviet-Polish relations and for strengthening friendship between the peoples of the two countries.

Participating in the conversation were, on the Soviet side: A.A. Titarenko and B.V. Kachura, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo members and secretaries; S.I. Gurenko and V.D. Kryuchkov, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo candidate members and secretaries; K.I. Masik, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo candidate member and Kiev Gorkom first secretary; V.K. Vrublevskiy and A.V. Merkulov, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee members; and on the Polish side by W. Natorf, PZPR Central Committee member and ambassador of the Polish People's Republic to the USSR; J. Gajewicz, PZPR Central Committee member and first secretary of Krakow Voivodship PZPR Committee; T. Sawic, PZPR Central Committee member and director of the Culture Department of the PZPR Central Committee; S. Nowicki and J. Zielinski, secretaries of Przemysl and Katowice PZPR Voivodship Committees; and R. Polkowski, consul general of the Polish People's Republic in Kiev.

Poland's Czyrek Speaks at Bialystok Meeting

LD2211001488 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2000 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Bialystok, 21 Nov (TASS)—The PZPR leadership is interested in the development of border contacts between Poland and the Soviet Union bringing results as soon as possible, not only in the regional plane but also in the whole volume of Polish-Soviet relations, Jozef Czyrek, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, declared. He spoke at the end of the 1st day of a roundtable meeting between CPSU and PZPR cooperation committees in Bialystok. Taking part are leading CPSU Central Committee and PZPR Central Committee employees, and party delegations from the RSFSR, Belorussia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and bordering voivodships and oblasts.

On both sides, J. Czyrek noted, there is striving toward the development and a broadening of the scale of border cooperation. The processes taking place in our two countries are following the same course; that is why the

successes of restructuring in the USSR are also our successes, while the successful realization of socialist renewal in Poland gladdens our Soviet friends, he said.

Zaykov Receives Budapest MSZMP Delegation

PM1811142788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Nov 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Fraternal Unity"]

[Text] On 16 November L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, received a Budapest MSZMP City Committee delegation headed by M. Jasso, first secretary of the party city committee.

It was pointed out during the meeting that friendship and cooperation between the party organizations of Moscow and Budapest are developing successfully. They are founded on the common policy of the CPSU and the MSZMP of the revolutionary renewal of socialist society.

S. Rajnai, Hungarian ambassador to the USSR, participated in the talks, which were held in a cordial, friendly atmosphere.

Belgrade Rally Demands End to Kosovo 'Drama'

PM2211112788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
22 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Kolosov dispatch "From the Scene of Events": "Rally in Belgrade: Fraternity and Unity!"]

[Text] Belgrade—Hundreds of thousands of people took to the streets in the Yugoslav capital last Saturday. An impressive rally of working people was held in Novi Beograd under the motto "Fraternity and Unity."

The rally had been announced in advance, and militia helicopters were circling in the sunny morning sky long before it began, while reinforced details stood on the main roads, streets, and squares to keep order. The newspaper POLITIKA had carried a plan of an extensive area around the confluence of the Sava and the Danube, where people from many of the country's cities were to gather. Thousands of buses and cars arrived in the capital from various places. All the main points of vital importance were marked on the plan: medical centers, food and soft drink kiosks, information centers, and militia headquarters. Everything was well organized, and the crowded people's assembly passed without incident, although the posters above the demonstrators' heads were of a far from festive nature: "We will destroy bureaucracy in every factory and throughout the federation!" "The people refuse to go on living like this!" "We demand a peaceful life, work, and order!" and "End the Kosovo drama!"

The main leitmotif of the speeches—and the rally was concluded by Slobodan Milosevic, chairman of the League of Communists of Serbia Central Committee Presidium—was the "Kosovo drama," which in recent years has turned into "an open wound on the body of Yugoslavia," as people here say.

Kosovo is an autonomous province whose population is chiefly made up of Albanians. It is the most backward region both economically and socially. Suffice it to say that the per capita income of the population there is several times lower than in a developed republic such as Slovenia. It is known that poverty and backwardness are a most fertile soil for the growth of nationalism. At certain periods national relations there have taken on such a tense nature that special militia detachments have had to be introduced into Kosovo. The hotbed of tension is flaring up increasingly because of the enforced departure from the province of the Serbs and Montenegrins who have lived there from time immemorial and who are being driven out by terrorism and increasingly difficult living conditions. The situation has become particularly acute in recent months, when nationalist elements in the form of Albanian counterrevolution have set themselves the task of turning the province into an "ethnically pure Kosovo"—that is, wresting it from Serbia....

Yet we can say that the "Kosovo problem" is a catalyst rather than the cause of the unquiet times through which Yugoslavia is living. The people have emerged at the political forefront because of the constantly deepening economic and political crisis. Not a day goes by without the prices of food and other essentials being changed in the store windows. Inflation is driving them upward, leaving far behind the purchasing power of the broad working masses.

Why was this rally held under the motto of "Fraternity and Unity"? Because a process of disintegration, of the federation's dismemberment, is taking place. Each republic lives in its own way, but it is impossible seriously to rectify matters in the economy without unity, without a single market within the framework of socialist self-management. The Yugoslav Communists' perfectly clear position was formulated at the last LCY party conference: "Disregard of or failure to recognize the market's impact on production are strengthening etatism, bureaucratism, and voluntarism on the economic and social planes—which is leading to the degradation and undermining of the economic efficiency and political democracy of self-managing socialism." This is precisely why the present reform pursues the chief and essentially its only aim of ending overregimentation in the organization of economic life, eliminating administrative pressure on the economy, and granting working people greater independence in planning production.

To halt the disintegration of the process, to begin without delay the country's unification on a platform of socialist self-management, and to put an end to nationalism—these are the main ideas aired at the Belgrade rally. It was an earnest discussion between the people and the party, a discussion about fraternity and unity....

This is what I understood from the slogans fluttering over the heads of the 1.5 million-strong army of rally participants and from the speeches by the few but completely authoritative speakers—at the rally which, so it is written here, "passed in a peaceful and dignified manner."

West Europe

PRAVDA Notes Geneva Aeroflot Office Bombing

PM2211094388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Bombing"]

[Text] Geneva, 19 Nov—The Aeroflot office in Geneva was bombed yesterday afternoon by persons unknown. The premises suffered material damage.

At a press conference here a police department spokesman informed journalists that the detonation of a bomb of large destructive force placed in a trash can opposite the Aeroflot display window on one of the city center's busiest junctions had injured several passers-by. Three are in a serious condition. There were no casualties among the Aeroflot staff members on the premises.

A local television station was phoned by an unidentified caller who reported that responsibility for this action is claimed by some "socialist nationalist movement." This organization is not known to the Geneva police.

Author Cited on French Secret Service

PM2111121788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 88 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko: "They Are Still Haunted by Red Agents"]

[Text] Paris—A few months before the visit by the then prime minister, J. Chirac, to the Soviet Union in May 1987, President F. Mitterrand warned him: "You'll see.... the DST (Directorate for Territorial Oversight—the French counterintelligence—Yu.K.) will cook up something for you."

The president turned out to be right. On the threshold of the visit the special services organized a noisy show involving television, the radio, and the press on the subject of how the Russians were chasing after the secrets of the Ariane missile. Soon it emerged that this affair had been fabricated by the DST, which nonetheless achieved its purpose: The results of J. Chirac's trip were far more modest than had been supposed and the absurd accusations of espionage levelled against the Soviet Union were partly to blame for that.

This is the story which begins "The Secret Services" ["Sekretnyye Sluzhby"] by Jean Ginel and Bernard Viole [both surnames as transliterated], which has just been published at the Decouverte publishing house.

"We opened our book with the Ariane affair because it is a typical example of how the DST operates," I was told by B. Viole, whom I invited to the IZVESTIYA correspondents center. "We have succeeded in showing the mechanism of how it was fabricated. After several months' research I was convinced that apart from some assumptions, the investigator had absolutely no evidence! The entire operation had been undertaken by the special services to apply pressure on Chirac's government."

...F. Mitterrand, the book says, summoned DST chief B. Gerard and expressed to him in sharp terms his dissatisfaction over the "Ariane missile case" which contained accusations against people who had nothing with which to reproach themselves. Accusations that the Russians want to obtain the blueprints of the cryogenic engine are absurd, the president stated, because they have had it for a long time.

"But why then did the DST need to organize this show?" I asked Bernard Viole.

[Viole] Very simple. Some 90 percent of DST employees are inveterate anticommunists. In other special services, for instance the General Directorate for External Services (DGSE—it is subordinated to the Defense Ministry—Yu.K.) this percentage is even higher. They see Reds everywhere. Counterespionage chief Colonel Jean Moro [surname as transliterated] is haunted by Russians everywhere.

The colonel considered one well-known Paris journalist to be a Kremlin agent merely because he could not understand where he got so much money. As for the critical articles about the Soviet Union he has written, Moro believes that he wrote them exclusively to mislead his own people. Before they go to sleep DGSE agents look under their beds to make sure there are no Reds hiding there. For them the South African regime is a model of democracy and the newspaper LE MONDE (influential publication close to the Socialist Party—Yu.K.) is the organ of international communism.

DGSE agents sunk the "Rainbow Warrior" ship belonging to Greenpeace in a New Zealand port and Prime Minister L. Fabius knew nothing of the operation! At the same time, DGSE Chief P. Marion has forbidden a group of parliamentarians to visit the directorate he heads merely because the group included Communist deputies.

[Kovalenko] You write that the special service chief considers himself to be nothing more nor less than a foreign minister or superminister who behaves as the equal of some heads of state.

[Viole] That is what he is. The enormous power rapidly goes to their heads. Alexandre de Marenches, who headed the special service for 11 years, resigned when the left-wing government came to power in 1981 because

he could not come to terms with the participation of Communist ministers in it. He had "special relations" with the shah of Iran and with the Saudi royal court. At the same time he maintained contacts with the Italian businessman F. Pazienza, who was involved in many crimes. [Viole ends]

"...The special services can impose their viewpoint even on a powerful man like the president of the French Republic," the book by J. Ginel and B. Viole notes. "Of course, in principle the incumbent of the Elysee Palace (the president) has the last word, but his opportunities for maneuver are often very restricted. The special services know how to get their way...."

[Kovalenko] General de Gaulle and F. Mitterrand did not conceal their distrust in the special services. Did they try somehow to change their status?

[Viole] Their distrust was linked primarily with the fact that it is difficult to control the special services and at any particular moment they could present a particular danger to the authorities. But neither de Gaulle nor Mitterrand succeeded in carrying out any serious reform. It is too difficult—there are so many clans and groupings there. [Viole ends]

...Indeed the special services themselves are a complex system of various organizations and departments which are—theoretically—subordinate to the internal affairs and defense ministries and the president and prime minister. According to the scheme published in the book by J. Ginel and B. Viole, in addition to the DST and the DGSE there is the "renseignements generaux" intelligence service central directorate, the national gendarmerie, the electronic monitoring group, the safety and security directorate, the center for the use of military intelligence, and others....

[Kovalenko] You write of the victims of "excessive zeal" on the part of the cloak and dagger knights. Are there many of these victims?

[Viole] Yes, there are far more than we have mentioned in our book. There are French people and foreigners, including your compatriot Lyudmila Varigina. For instance, one Lebanese student spent 18 months in prison. There was no evidence of his guilt apart from the testimony of a policeman, but that was enough to keep him behind bars. It is true that the student was later released—for want of formal evidence of the crime.

[Kovalenko] I learned from your book that Afghan opposition members have undergone training in France. How was this training organized?

[Viole] In 1986 the authorities agreed to the DGSE forces training a group of Afghan rebels. For several months at the paratroopers' training center in the little spot of Cercottes, near Orleans, they were taught how to use sophisticated weapons, for instance the Milan anti-tank missiles, and communications facilities. At the same time the DGSE also trained mercenaries for the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA]. Its leaders made trips to the Angolan jungles, where they met with UNITA ringleader J. Savimbi. They sought to strengthen Paris' ties with that grouping.

[Kovalenko] Can frequent trips to the Soviet Union be viewed as a manifestation of unreliability?

[Viole] I think they make a bad impression on the special services. As indeed does the fact that I have visited your correspondents center. Someone warned me: You are going to IZVESTIYA—watch out, think about what you say. They want to use you for their own purposes.

[Kovalenko] Was it difficult for you to work on your book?

[Viole] So far there have been few books about the special services in France. Journalists who carried out the relevant research were considered "poor patriots" or, worse, traitors, "Moscow's underground agents [podlodki]." But after the sinking of the "Rainbow Warrior" the attitude toward them changed. We wanted to write a serious, accurate and truthful book. We checked and rechecked all the facts many times. Let the reader judge them now....

French Firms in CW Trade Despite Official Policy

PM1411110188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Nov 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Bolshakov "International Notes": "'Buy Chemical Weapons'"]

[Text] Paris, Nov—France has suggested holding an international conference on banning chemical weapons in Paris in January 1989.

The goal of its participants, who will include primarily the states that signed the 1925 Geneva protocol banning the use of chemical weapons, will be to give the necessary political boost to talks aimed at concluding an international convention on the elimination of all kinds of chemical weapons. This initiative advanced by President F. Mitterrand and supported by the USSR, the United States, and other countries has from the outset met with resistance from the "chemical magnates" who get rich by producing toxins and exporting them to developing countries. It has come to light that there are many enterprises belonging to them in France.

L'HUMANITE recently reproduced pages of a catalogue directory for 1988 officially distributed in Paris. In accordance with "NATO nomenclature" it cites the addresses of French manufacturers and exporters of toxic weapons. Thus, the firm of Etienne Lacroix features in the section "Group 10—Chemical Weapons and Equipment." Its plants are located in the city of Muret,

Haute Garonne Department. The majority of the French people know of this firm only as a producer of fireworks equipment, while its military activity is shrouded in secrecy. In the same catalogue, however, Etienne Lacroix is also mentioned in section 1365—"Combat Toxins." There with it are the firms of Alsetex S.A.E., SNPe Ingenerie, and Societe Nationale des Poudres et Explosifs (SNPE) with headquarters in Paris.

To judge from a mass of data, as the journalist Jean-Pierre Ravery writes in L'HUMANITE, SNPE is the head enterprise producing chemical weapons. L'HUMANITE's correspondent telephoned the director of the plant at Bracqueville, not far from Toulouse, which belongs to SNPE and where neuroparalytic toxins were produced in the sixties. Officially today the plant produces only civilian output, as B. Wiedemann, its director, confirmed in the newspaper interview. So how come SNPE found itself in the directory of producers of chemical weapons for 1988? The directory's publisher told L'HUMANITE that he had included the names of firms in the sections corresponding to NATO nomenclature only after he had obtained their consent. Thus SNPE did not object to importers of combat toxins knowing that it supplies to the weapons market the output advertised in the directory in French, English, and Arabic? SNPe Ingenerie, its daughter firm, also trains specialists, including foreign ones, to handle chemical weapons.

As L'HUMANITE writes, the production of chemical weapons in France and their export plainly contradict official Paris' readiness to get the stalled process of chemical disarmament going again. The reasons for this are obvious—producers of lethal gases and aerosols are making millions and will not abandon this dangerous business until they have been outlawed. Precisely this goal must be served by a convention on a total ban on the use and production of chemical weapons and the destruction of all stockpiles of them. The upcoming Paris conference on chemical weapons could be an important step on the way to achieving this goal.

Iberian Motives Behind Joining WEU Viewed

PM1711161388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 5

["Madrid-Lisbon Dialogue" between IZVESTIYA correspondents Vladimir Vernikov and Pavel Golub: "The WEU and the Future of the Continent"; first three paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Recently a seemingly forgotten abbreviation—WEU—has begun appearing increasingly often in the newspapers and the political vocabulary. The Western European Union, as a military alliance made up of seven countries—Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—formally came into being in 1954 but for many years thereafter seemed to be in a state of suspended animation.

But more than 2 years ago the WEU was revived politically on the initiative of France, which, compared with the other countries, has shown the greatest activeness on this question. The new military bloc, designed to supplement NATO, as it were, in fact exists already. Its members are fully set on creating powerful armed forces and retaining nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the membership of the WEU is being enlarged by the entry of Spain and Portugal, according to the official document which the two countries' foreign ministers are due to sign in London 14 November.

What is the reaction to this step in Spain and Portugal; what brought it about; what will they gain from entry into the WEU; and what military, political, or economic benefits does the future membership of yet another military alliance offer? These questions form the subject of the dialogue between our own correspondents in Madrid and Lisbon, Vladimir Vernikov and Pavel Golub.

[Vernikov] It is easy to find an answer to some of those questions in Madrid in the official statements by representatives of the Gonzalez government. For example, during the recent visit here by British Prime Minister Thatcher the question of Spain's admission to the WEU was treated by the two sides as a foregone conclusion and a "step in the right direction toward the creation of a European nuclear umbrella over the continent." True, this raises a great many ticklish points about Spain's officially proclaimed non-nuclear status, which will be reduced to a mere declaration by its entry into the WEU.

Unlike the government's position, Spanish public opinion is highly alarmed at such a prospect. In my view the newspaper EL PAIS made this point quite accurately some time ago: "A Trojan horse is galloping across Europe once more. Its name is the WEU. But we must not be as naive as the defenders of Troy. The WEU will draw us into a new arms race, this time labeled 'Made in Europe.' That is quite logical because the closest link exists between NATO and the WEU."

Nevertheless, Madrid undoubtedly had its reasons for seeking this alliance, even though those reasons are not incontestable. In the first place, tribute must be paid to the socialist government's ability to maneuver in the very difficult situation that developed for it during the lengthy haggling over the reduction of the U.S. military presence in the country, the conclusion of a new defense treaty with the United States, and the still incomplete talks on the country's actual contribution to NATO activities. Second, by no means of least importance here is the desire for Spain's full integration in the West European community with all the ensuing economic benefits and advantages of that. Third and last, the Spanish military industry—one of the world's largest arms exporters—has long been casting covetous glances at the European arms "pie," seeking not only to take a piece for itself but also to make it "fatter."

[Golub] A familiar refrain! It has also been heard in Portugal, although with a local "accent." The authorities here also link membership in the WEU with political and economic benefits, but those who disagree with such a serious and in many ways binding step are urging a more careful analysis of its possible consequences and are expressing concern at the country's involvement in yet another international military-political organization.

Four years ago the Portuguese leadership viewed entry into the WEU as a "logical supplement" to the plans for economic and political integration in the Common Market. But then, in 1986, it seemed the time had come to reassess the advisability of joining the WEU and to realize that it would result in Lisbon's having to assume very considerable commitments. In their speeches Portuguese leaders began saying that a decision on this question was not urgent, while the newspapers even began to mention the so-called "conditions" the government would make for the country's membership of the WEU.

On the other hand—and herein lies the difference between Portugal and Spain—neither the government here nor the country's parliament has ever taken a non-nuclear stance or announced refusal to take part in the allies' nuclear strategy.

[Vernikov] That, so to speak, is a political factor, and it is clear that because of it Spain will find it quite difficult to justify its U-turn on the "nuclear question," whereas for Portugal it is an easier matter—it is following its own course, even though it is a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the government continues constantly to assure public opinion that there are no nuclear weapons in the country, not even at the U.S. military bases. It is appropriate to recall here that the "Platform of European Security Principles" adopted at last year's WEU Council session in The Hague stated quite clearly: The military sphere is inseparable from economic and political integration, which is to be completed in 1992 by the creation of a "united Europe," and the WEU's main military doctrine continues to be the policy of nuclear deterrence [sderzhivaniye]. Or rather, nuclear intimidation [ustrasheniye]. As we have seen, Spain and Portugal have no choice since they have decided to join this organization.

But now let us talk about the economic aspect of the two countries' membership in the WEU, the so-called benefits. In my opinion there is a definite similarity here with their simultaneous entry into the Common Market and the high hopes at that time of the same economic advantages as now.

[Golub] I agree with the first conclusion and the analogy and I'd like to mention that recently a high-ranking government official told me in confidence the opinion current in his immediate circles that Portugal regards the WEU not so much as the "European bulwark" of NATO but as the "military bulwark" of the EEC. Nevertheless, when I asked Prime Minister A. Cavaco Silva recently how the country's leadership views Portugal's participation in the WEU's activity, he replied that it expects its membership to make a positive contribution to the strengthening of military security on the continent.

[Vernikov] According to that logic, it seems that the creation of collective security in Europe depends on.... active participation in military alliances....

[Golub] That is how it seems. Economic advantages, however, should not be expected in the short term. Portugal's 2 years in the EEC, like Spain's, not only have not brought it any appreciable material advantages but also have aggravated many serious economic problems, primarily in agriculture and fishing, and caused an increase in the foreign trade deficit. It is not so easy to compensate for those problems. I believe that this partly dictates Portugal's desire to join the WEU and to join as much as possible in the very generously funded military programs of the FRG, France, and Britain. The advantages from this, in its opinion, will not be only political. Nevertheless, let us wait and see before drawing any conclusions.

[Vernikov] Spain is convinced that its membership of the WEU will be profitable. Not only politically but also economically. Madrid is trying not to make too much of this aspect—whatever else, it is a question of the military business—but known facts provide very convincing proof of this.

For example, its involvement with other WEU countries in creating the European fighter of the nineties holds out the prospect of substantial orders and revenue for its aircraft plants, as do the latest tanks for its machine building plants; and there are warships, armaments, and electronics goods in the offing. France, which is creating its own new combat aircraft, is trying to court Spain. True, all this requires considerable capital investments (600 billion pesetas just for the development of the aircraft!) drawn from the civilian sectors of the economy and from social programs, but it seems that the Spanish Socialists are ready to do this in anticipation of future benefits not only from involvement in joint projects but also from the sale of military hardware to other countries. That this represents essentially a new spiral of the arms race, this time in European arms, is being played down.

I make no secret of the fact that Madrid political observers and representatives of the left-wing forces are thinking more about the political consequences of Spain's decision to join the WEU than about its economic advantages.

[Golub] It is somewhat pointless to talk about this in Madrid and Lisbon now: The choice has been made, and the consent of the partners and their desire to admit Spain and Portugal into the WEU have been backed up by an official decision. Of course, this is primarily a

political action by the governments of the two countries of the Iberian peninsula, and the expansion of the "revived" military alliance in Europe makes you think about the consequences of this action.

[Vernikov] The head of the Spanish Government calls the WEU "another necessary forum on security problems within the framework of European development." An inoffensive phrase if you are unaware of the true aims of this organization.

[Golub] I think that we have broached all the questions connected with the two countries' forthcoming entry into the WEU. In conclusion, I would like to cite what E. Moradas Ferreira, the well known Portuguese public figure and vice president of the national association "Portuguese Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War," told me in conversation: "It is particularly important now for all the peoples, including the Portuguese people, to participate in improving the situation in Europe, reducing the level of military confrontation on the continent, and building a durable 'common European home,' not in deepening its division into hostile groupings."

[Vernikov] Undoubtedly sound and correct words. I was told roughly the same by F. de Salas Lopez, a well known Spanish political scientist and rector of the Society for International Research into the Problems of the Mediterranean: "There are still quite a few difficulties in the way of creating a peaceful Europe, but this does not mean that one should be afraid of them or sit and wait for disaster to happen." It is to be hoped that the Spanish and Portuguese Governments share this understanding of the European peoples' responsibilities. And that responsibility for the peaceful future of the continent will guide them in their political decisions relating to their membership in the WEU.

Business Magazine Published in Finnish Venture

LD1811002388 Moscow International Service in Finnish 1530 GMT 16 Nov 88

[Summary] A new magazine named MOSCOW BUSINESS is being published under a Soviet-Finnish joint venture. The magazine is published in Finnish, English, and Russian. The first issue came out in Helsinki today. The magazine is meant for businessmen and experts and will publish six issues a year. It will be distributed in Finland, the USSR, North America, and the Nordic countries. Later the magazine may be published in German.

Political & Social

Supsov Commission Meets on Republics' Proposals

PM2111163188 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Nov 88 Second Edition p 2

[Yu. Nikolayev report: "In the Interest of All of Us. Notes From Joint Session of USSR Supreme Soviet Legislative Proposals Commissions"]

[Text] I will stipulate at once that we will not confine ourselves here to a sequential retelling of how the joint session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Legislative Proposals Commissions took place in the Kremlin yesterday. The reader, along with the author, will probably find it interesting also to look into the corridors, where what was happening was actively being commented upon.

Here is a noteworthy feature: G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the Soviet of the Union Legislative Proposals Commission, who was in the chair, opened the joint session at 1100, as planned, and at once proposed deferring the start of work for another hour. This was with the sole aim of enabling each deputy once again to take a careful look at the proposals prepared on the materials of the nationwide discussion of the new draft laws and comprehensively weigh them before reaching final assessments.

Then this particular point, this extreme responsibility, was also emphasized by V.G. Lomonosov, leader of the deputies' preparatory commission and deputy chairman of the AUCCTU, who delivered the report.

"I was involved in drawing up the laws on the state enterprise and on cooperatives," he said. "At that time, too, people showed great interest, and many arguments arose. But this is the first time we have met with such vigor as now."

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has already received more than 120,000 proposals and comments on the draft laws. Many proposals concern the most important points in the draft laws: the procedure for forming the highest organs of state power, the definition of the powers of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and of the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium, the status of people's deputies, the procedure for electing judges... Too many proposals to enumerate!

Just one thing can be said with confidence. The deputies scrupulously study every opinion and endeavor to take the maximum account of the results of the nationwide expert appraisal. To the draft Law on Changes and Additions to the USSR Constitution alone, the preparatory commission proposed making more than 40 amendments and amplifications concerning 24 out of the 53 articles submitted for discussion.

Perhaps the most significant number of amplifications are aimed at creating the necessary conditions to ensure the republics' autonomy [samostoyatelnost] and extend the competence of their supreme soviets.

Not all the proposed amendments were adopted unanimously. Here is a characteristic example.

The draft law states: "A USSR citizen cannot simultaneously be a deputy of more than two soviets of people's deputies." This point was subjected to wholesale criticism in Soviet people's letters and labor collectives' resolutions. The preparatory commission proposed formulating it as follows: "A USSR citizen can be a deputy on only one representative organ of state power, with the exception of chairmen of soviets of people's deputies..." You would think that is clear!

Then a deputy stood up and proposed a question: "But what would this mean? If an intelligent kolkhoz chairman, for example, were elected a deputy of the village soviet, would he thereby be deprived of the possibility of being on the rayon, oblast, or, finally, supreme soviet?"

I remembered an argument which flared up at a session of the preparatory commission as to what should happen in the case of a minister. It would seem logical for the leader of an administration or sector not to be a deputy of the soviet to which he is accountable. But, on the other hand, can a minister really not run as a candidate for a soviet, like any citizen? Why infringe his rights?

Yesterday a similar argument arose at the joint session of the Legislative Proposals Commissions, only with regard to judges, prosecutors, and state arbiters, who also "cannot be deputies of the soviet on whose territory they exercise their functions." USSR Supreme Court First Deputy Chairman S.I. Gusev and USSR Deputy General Prosecutor A.D. Vasilyev objected to this.

Again there was a debate.

"In my opinion, the chief thing is that people who are really capable of defending the interests both of the state and of the individual should become deputies, regardless of their posts," Kh.K. Ayba, chairman of the 24th CPSU Congress Kolkhoz in Abkhazia, declared, for example.

G.S. Sadretdinova, chairman of a village soviet ispolkom in Tataria, mounted the rostrum:

"I would like to emphasize the need for amplifications to the Law on Elections..."

Not one proposal was taken on trust, without discussion.

For the sake of accuracy it should be said that the commission did not adopt all the proposed amendments. M.I. Fomicheva, member of the Legislative Proposals Commission and foreman at Riga's "Lenta" Textile and

Haberdashery Factory, for example, submitted a proposal to consider union laws adopted only if all deputies' groups representing the union republics vote for them. That is, it was essentially a question of granting the right of veto to any republican deputies' group and, thus, enabling it to impose its will on the entire Supreme Soviet and then on the Congress of People's Deputies. That proposal was rejected.

The same fate befell the proposal of Deputy Kh.Kh. Parik, director of the "Tartu" Sovkhoz in Estonia, "to adopt only those changes and additions to the draft laws that are necessary for holding elections to the supreme organ of state power, while deferring an examination of the rest."

The previous day I had talked with Mariya Ivanovna Fomicheva, and she had no intention at all of speaking about a "veto" but was deeply concerned about the increasing dissension in the republic, which is now complicating the life of workers and employees. But she was insistently advised to speak in just that way.

Kheyno Khansovich Parik also expressed his concern at the "excessive emotionality" in Estonians' relations with people of other nationalities living in the republic. He described to me the zeal with which the 760 workers of 13 nationalities on the "Tartu" Sovkhoz had worked shoulder to shoulder under this year's difficult weather conditions to grow and gather the harvest. He feared that the situation, which has become more complex, would affect discipline and the attitude to work. Nevertheless, he fulfilled the demand of his electors or, to be more accurate, of representatives of the Popular Front, setting forth their position at the commissions' session.

In accordance with an instruction of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the session of the Legislative Proposals Commissions also examined the question of the decisions adopted by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet 16 November 1988. Doctor of Juridical Sciences Professor V.I. Vasilyev convincingly confirmed that those decisions are at variance with existing legislation. It was emphasized that, according to Article 74 of the USSR Constitution, USSR laws have identical force on the territory of all union republics. In accordance with Point 4 of Article 73 of the USSR Constitution, the USSR ensures the unity of legislative regulation throughout the USSR's territory through its supreme organs of power and management. It follows from this that the operation of laws and other acts of the USSR's supreme organs cannot be suspended or limited by a union republic, although this is precisely what people are trying to do in Estonia.

Well-reasoned criticism was also leveled at other "amendments" to the Estonian SSR Constitution—which was then reflected in a detailed conclusion of the Legislative Proposals Commissions which will be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Just one vote was cast against this conclusion, by the deputy from Estonia...

As we see, the assessment here is unequivocal, but there is no satisfaction. This tension which has arisen in relations between inhabitants of the indigenous and nonindigenous nationalities is alarming. And this is not just in Estonia but in the other Baltic republics, as the mail nowadays bears out.

"For a year now we have been living in a situation of growing tension in interethnic relations in Estonia. Following the creation and the formulation of the platform and program first of the Tartu and then of the Estonian Popular Front, the republican press, radio, and television have created the image of some kind of newcomer, migrant, or second-class person incapable of integrating into the structure of society and unworthy to live in Estonia..." This is from a letter by A. Kovaleva, N. Serykh, L. Mikhaylichenko, and 32 other residents of Tallinn.

Here is what Chursin, Kozhukovskaya, and others report from Klaypeda. "The 'Sajudis' informal Lithuanian movement for restructuring has called on the population to oppose the alterations and additions to the USSR Constitution. Even schoolchildren have been going around apartments collecting children's signatures to an 'appeal'...."

The mail contains plenty of examples of such "appeals." They usually consist of several totally ill-argued appeals to defer the adoption of the Law on Changes and Additions to the USSR Constitution because it is said to contradict "the principles of Soviet federalism" and does not accord with "the decisions of the 19th party conference." How does it contradict them? In what way does it not accord with them? People cannot understand. But their signatures are being demanded...

To be fair, it has to be noted that many sensible, constructive proposals are also being made from these republics, including on questions of improving national development [natsionalnoye obustroystvo]. It was stated at the Legislative Proposals Commissions' session that they will all be studied carefully and taken into account subsequently when drawing up the new legal acts.

Participating in the session's work were A.I. Lukyanov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Yu.N. Khristoradnov and A.E. Voss, chairmen of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities; T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and leaders of a number of USSR ministries and departments.

'Extensive' Conclusion on Estonia

PM2211114188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Nov 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Session in the Kremlin"]

[Text] A session of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' Legislative Proposals Commissions was held in the Kremlin 19 November. The session discussed the question of the examination of the proposals and comments received during the nationwide discussion of the USSR draft law on amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution and the USSR draft law on the election of USSR people's deputies. A report on this issue was delivered by V.G. Lomonosov, leader of the Deputies' Preparatory Commission and deputy chairman of the AUCCTU.

It was noted at the session that, following the publication of the draft laws in the press, they have been discussed nationwide by millions of people. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Legislative Proposals Commissions have received more than 120,000 proposals and comments from citizens, labor collectives, social organizations, scientific and educational establishments, and the mass media.

The draft laws have met with a great response from all sections of Soviet society and are receiving widespread support and approval. Our people see them as the real embodiment of the ideas of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. The adoption and practical implementation of the laws will allow soviets of people's deputies to really become sovereign organs for the people's self-management.

It was also stressed that the responses, comments, and observations on the drafts contain many constructive proposals. These relate to important provisions in the draft laws: the procedure for shaping the supreme organs of state power and defining the powers of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; the procedure for electing judges; and other provisions. All the proposals and criticisms have been closely examined by the Deputies' Preparatory Commission, and many of them have been taken into consideration and reflected in the draft laws.

Representatives of union republics, prominent scientists, and specialists took part in the generalization and examination of the proposals and comments, and the course of the Deputies' Preparatory Commission's work has been extensively covered by the mass media.

After a comprehensive discussion the Legislative Proposals Commission agreed to the amendments and clarifications proposed by the Deputies' Preparatory Commission to certain provisions of the draft laws, and adopted the decision to submit preparatory proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The deputies' commission will continue to examine incoming proposals on the draft laws.

In accordance with the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's instructions the session of the commissions also examined the question of the decisions made by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet on 16 November 1988. In their conclusion on these decisions the commissions noted that they contain a number of provisions contravening the norms of the USSR Constitution, on which the Soviet socialist federation is based. The commissions' extensive conclusion on this issue has been submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The session was chaired by G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and chairman of the Soviet of the Union Legislative Proposals Commission.

A.I. Lukyanov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, took part in the session's work.

Estonian Laws Would Weaken Union

PM2211105188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Nov 88 Second Edition p 2

[V. Lyubitskiy "Reportage From the Kremlin": "Laws That Govern Our Lives"]

[Text] It is obvious to everyone today that people's rapidly increasing sociopolitical activeness is among the most striking aspects of our comparatively brief period of restructuring. The nationwide discussion of the draft laws on changes and addenda to the USSR Constitution and on the election of the country's people's deputies gave it a new boost.

By 18 November the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium had received more than 100,000 comments and proposals from citizens, labor collectives, state and public organs, and the mass media. The reactions broadly support the aim of the upcoming reform of the political system—to ensure strong people's power and involve the broad masses in governing the country.

All the proposals are being examined attentively at sessions of the deputies' preparatory commission. The next stage of the work is to discuss them at the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' Legislative Proposals Commissions, a joint session of which was held 19 November in the Kremlin.

There are many materials for the session and they are substantive and crucial. Some arrived at the very last minute. That is why, on opening the session as scheduled at 1100 hours, G.P. Razumovskiy, candidate member of

the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, suggested postponing the work for 1 hour in order to give deputies a chance to familiarize themselves better with the proposals—notably by consulting the scientific and legal experts present.

An hour later the session resumed. V.G. Lomonosov, the leader of a deputies' subcommission, reported on how work on the draft laws is going. The preparatory commission proposed inserting more than 40 amendments and amplifications, affecting 24 of the 53 articles put forward for discussion, in the draft Law on Changes and Additions to the USSR Constitution.

In particular, in the light of proposals received the subcommission proposed wording Article 108, Paragraph 2 as follows: "The adoption of decisions on questions of the national state structure within the jurisdiction of the USSR," but removing from Paragraph 12 of this article the words to the effect that the abrogation of legislative acts adopted by union and autonomous republics' supreme organs of power lies exclusively within the jurisdiction of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. In the opinion of the deputies' subcommission, this and a number of other amendments will be geared toward developing the republics' sovereign rights.

A number of amendments proposed by the subcommission will serve to further democratize public and state life. Thus, it is proposed to exclude from Article 109 a clause regarding specific norms for representation from public organizations. This representation is needed per se—it will help the supreme organ of power to give better consideration to the interests of various social groups. The subcommission thinks that the law on elections rather than the Constitution could determine the number of representatives from these organizations.

V.A. Vasilyev, leader of a team of lathe operators at the Gorkiy Aviation Production Association, was the first to speak in the discussion. He announced the support of the association's labor collective for the published draft laws and approved, in particular, such clauses in the draft as the principle that deputies should not hold multiple posts and the broadening of opportunities for voters to discuss candidates' personal qualities and programs. Kh.K. Ayba, chairman of the Kolkhoz named for the 26th CPSU Congress in the Abkhaz ASSR, and G.S. Sadretdinova, chairman of the Kulbayevo-Marasinkiy Rural Soviet Ispolkom in Tataria's Oktyabrksiy Rayon, also expressed full support for the draft laws. The latter announced that numerous rural assemblies and labor collective meetings have taken place in the rayon and many proposals voiced there coincided with the subcommission's amendments.

Speaking at the session, M.I. Fomicheva, weaver at Riga's "Lenta" Textile and Haberdashery Factory, and Kh.Kh. Parik, director of the "Tartu" Experimental Model Sovkhoz named for the 50th anniversary of the USSR, proposed amending the draft laws so that the USSR Supreme Soviet can only adopt a decision with unanimity from all groups of deputies. However, V.I. Kazakov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, objected: In that case it is not impossible that a group of deputies from one union republic could impose their will on all the other USSR people's deputies. The members of the legislative proposals commissions unanimously decided to reject the proposed amendment.

The session's participants discussed a number of other proposals put forward from the floor. Summing up the results of the discussion, G.P. Razumovskiy said that the draft laws under discussion are only the first step in the upcoming reform of the political system mapped out by the 19th All-Union Party Conference. The task now is not to revise the entire USSR Constitution. However, all the proposals and opinions received will be studied thoroughly and used to further improve our legislation.

Varying and even mutually exclusive proposals have been voiced in the course of the nationwide discussion. There is real pluralism of opinion. At the same time, G.P. Razumovskiy pointed out, there are some unsubstantiated views, and some of the letters sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium have been "carbon" copied or even printed. One encounters proposals to adopt only the articles of the draft laws that concern the upcoming elections of USSR people's deputies. But how will the future supreme organs of power be able to work in that case? That's equivalent to moving into a house before it's finished.

The chambers' Legislative Proposals Commissions decided to approve the draft laws under discussion in the light of the amendments submitted and to present them to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for examination. Two deputies abstained from voting.

On the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's instructions, the commissions discussed the acts adopted by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet at its extraordinary session of 16 November 1988. Doctor of Juridical Sciences V.I. Vasilyev, leader of the working group, spoke on this question. Each union republic, he stressed, while being a sovereign republic is at the same time a member of the USSR. Admittedly, in practice there have been cases where the republics have adopted legislative acts that contravened the country's constitution, but these acts have been abrogated when this noncompliance was discovered.

The Estonian SSR law on amendments and additions to the republic's constitution and the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet's Declaration on the Sovereignty of the Estonian SSR contain clauses that do not correspond with the norms of the current USSR Constitution. Thus, Article 5 of the Estonian SSR law provides for the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium to register USSR laws as a preliminary condition for their operation on the republic's territory and the right of the republic's

Supreme Soviet to suspend or fix limits to the application of USSR legislative acts. Yet the country's law carries identical weight on the territory of all the union republics and, as is well known, the USSR through its supreme organs of power and management ensures unity of legislative regulation throughout the country's territory.

Article 4 of the Estonian SSR's law proclaimed the republic's exclusive ownership of the land, its mineral resources, waters, forests, and other natural resources and also the republic's ownership of a proportion of the main means of production and other property. However, under Article 11 of the USSR Constitution, these kinds of objects are the property of the entire Soviet people. In other words, the act that has been adopted infringes the economic system of Soviet socialist society and disregards the fact that the labor and resources of all the union republics and the entire Soviet people have been invested in creating and developing Estonia's economic complex. Article 3 of the Estonian SSR law provides for private ownership, the restoration of which would contradict the bases of the Soviet social system.

If the norms in the legislative acts adopted by the Estonian Supreme Soviet were elevated to a general principle, it was noted at the session, instead of a union state we would have only some kind of union of states with extremely weak internal ties. That is, the very foundations and principles of the USSR's existence would be undermined. The members of the chambers' Legislative Proposals Commissions adopted a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium draft decree on the question under discussion. One deputy voted against.

Lithuania's 'Sajudis' Movement Remains Active

Secretary Addresses Rally

LD2211004888 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 21 Nov 88

[From the "News About Lithuania" feature]

[Excerpts] Today, in the afternoon, pickets halted traffic for 10 minutes in the capital's [Vilnius] central streets. The pickets were staging a protest against the decision adopted by the session of the supreme soviet which was held on Friday. [passage omitted]

A secretary of the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis, (Salvadus Medelyenska), addressed a rally in Gedaminas Square which was some 4,000 strong. He said that both the Sajudis and the government had made mistakes in the past few days. The Sajudis demands that a special session of the supreme soviet be convened because the voting procedure was violated at the recent session.

This is the point of view held by 56 deputies, who have already signed the demand to convene a special session. To do this, 30 percent of all the deputies should sign the demand—that's 117 signatures are needed.

It's clear, though, the situation has prompted a certain friction between the government and the reform movement, Sajudis. [passage omitted]

Movement Seen as Divisive

PM2111181188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 88 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent D. Shnyukas article: "Democracy Means Responsibility"]

[Text] Vilnius—**I was chatting to a friend of mine from Moscow a few days ago. On parting, according to custom, I invited him to come to Vilnius.**

"Thanks, pal, but I don't have any Lithuanian currency. Nor do I know the language."

I know my friend well, he was just joking. But I also know that remarks and rejoinders like these are now also made in all seriousness.

We write very little about the Baltic region, and even when we do our main concern—this is in a journalist's nature—is to seek out the mistakes, even though there are two sides to any phenomenon, every phenomenon has its own roots and causes. This is why—if the readers would forgive me—I will venture a little further back in time, at the start of the movement which is linked with the name "Sajudis" in Lithuania.

Lithuania approached the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum with fewer losses than some other republics. Here there were no sensational trials for corruption, bribery, and mafia activities—and I hope there never will be. This evidently dulled the determination of the republic party organization's leadership to embark on restructuring at full steam. The ideas of democratization and glasnost hung in the air without support and realization from above.

The 19th All-Union Party Conference was approaching. There were fears about the fate of restructuring. It was at that time, in June, that the "Sajudis" action group was created in Lithuania, composed of mainly eminent scientists, members of the creative intelligentsia, Communists, and nonparty people. In just 6 months "Sajudis" grew into an influential public movement and organized its constituent congress which approved its statute and program. They declared total support for the course of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th party conference, and its future work was to be built on three pillars — democratization, glasnost, and a Leninist perception of the union republic's sovereignty. Enjoying a great intellectual potential among its members, this public movement put ideas forward more effectively and with better arguments and was swifter in achieving their implementation than the party and state organs. This won it popularity and support. By early October there was even an impression that the master of the situation was not the republic party organization but "Sajudis." At that

time, and on a demand by Communists, an organizational plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee was convened, and A.K. Brazauskas was elected first secretary of the Central Committee. The process of restructuring gathered confidence, and constructive cooperation was established between the republic leadership and "Sajudis."

What has been done?

First, it is obviously necessary to note the unrestrainable march of glasnost which was aimed at exposing the crimes of the Stalinshchina times. Whether we want it or not, de-Stalinization also excites national feelings, national dignity and awareness. Bluntly speaking, its development is far from unemotional.

All who were illegally repressed have been rehabilitated by resolutions from republic authorities, and they are to receive compensation for material damage. Labor collectives and kolkhozes are looking for ways to provide them with housing. There is not a single political prisoner in Lithuania now.

It seems as if the press, in all the years of Soviet power, has not published as many articles on Lithuania's history as it has done this year. People are casting off the blindfolds of dogmatism; growing numbers of personalities and monuments of culture and art are being restored to Soviet Lithuania's national culture. Some of them are being literally dug out of the earth where they had ended up at the will of zealous functionaries. Government commissions have been set up to investigate the mass shooting of people in the localities of Raynyay and Pravenishkes and elsewhere.

The only pity is that, on the basis of the claim that "much was written earlier," people at times forget the crimes of the fascists and their Lithuanian goons, the fact that genuine class struggle was also waged in the postwar years. The powers that be struggled not only against Stalinshchina, as some people now try to convince us, but also against the principles of socialism in general.

People know what is being done in Lithuania today—from the newspapers and television forums which at times take up virtually most of the air time. Nobody complains—everybody's political activeness is high. One of the principles of socialism—every person must participate in running the state—is being implemented. It is necessary to welcome the institution of the "Government Studio" by Lithuanian Television, with one of the republic leaders speaking every Friday and answering viewers' questions live over the telephone.

There have been great steps forward in the democratization of life and social relations, criticism has lost its prohibited zones, and the command and directive tone is disappearing. Certain vacation homes and trading centers that were formerly enjoyed only by a certain circle of people or high-ranking guests have been handed over to trade unions or children, and "order desks" using special lists have been closed. Elections of leaders on a competitive basis from among several candidates are also becoming a common phenomenon. The elections of secretaries at rayon party conferences are taking place in the same way—without prompting or pressure from outside, and as a rule the people elected are the worthiest, most principled people who meet the spirit of restructuring.

The attitude toward the church and believers has changed in the republic. Confrontation and aggressive atheism are giving way to dialogue and cooperation in such important areas of our life as the struggle for peace, honesty, industriousness, and temperance, and against theft, moral degeneracy, and so forth. Certain churches have been or are to be returned to the believers.

The core of our restructuring is the economy. We are all convinced of the inefficacy of the machinery of rigid centralization, coercive methods, and the thousands of instructions and hundreds of commissions that zealously told us how to organize the economy while themselves hampering it. That is why people in Lithuania siezed with great enthusiasm on the idea of republican economic accountability. On one hand, it shifts the responsibility to us and deprives us of the opportunity of blaming the center, and on the other, I think, it will give initiative a free hand and give management greater autonomy and flexibility. The Academy of Sciences, the republic Gosplan, and "Sajudis" worked together to develop the concept, inviting prominent scientists from Moscow to take part in the debate. People see another advantage in regional economic autonomy—the resolution of the accumulated ecological problems that our central departments ignored.

The most sensitive, hotly debated aspect of the social processes taking place in the Baltic region is national relations. In the years of Stalinism and Brezhnevism this fundamental component of our union state was replaced by declarations about the peoples' friendship, the Stalinist policy of national relations was described as Leninist, and manifestations of a national nature were often branded nationalism. The ill-considered siting of production facilities led to population migration and in some republics the indigenous inhabitants ceased to feel they were masters of the land allotted to them by history. Naturally, in the age of restructuring this issues flared up, and by virtue of their special sensitivity disagreements, disputes, and arguments arise.

In Lithuania these have arisen mainly over the proposal to give the Lithuanian language the status of state language. Yet a very large number of Russians and Poles living here, especially young people, know and use the Lithuanian language. Objections arose. Because of this, mutual accusations of nationalism and chauvinism sprang up in turn. Although everyone acknowledges in public that national intolerance and narrow-minded nationalism are only the fault of individual ignorant

people, the split in society on the basis of nationality has become marked. The informal association "Yedinstvo" ["Unity"] was set up recently as a counterweight to "Sajudis," and its platform was set forth in the newspapers and on television. Although both movements proclaim the same goals and invite people of all nationalities to join their ranks, it is no secret that you seldom encounter members of the Russian-speaking population in "Sajudis" or Lithuanians in "Yedinstvo." The associations do not yet feel any particular sympathy toward each other.

The author of these lines is a Lithuanian. He, like other Lithuanians, believes that the declaration made at the Supreme Soviet session, declaring Lithuanian the state language, will not be detrimental to the dignity and rights of national minorities. After all, the law clearly stipulates that every condition will be created for the use and study of all languages, and Russian especially as the instrument of intercourse between nationalities. In any institution an oral or written application [zayavleniye] in Russian receives a response in Russian. The same is true of the service sphere, medical institutions, and so forth. On the other hand, the squeezing out of the Lithuanian language by central departments is being stopped. After all, until recently people were not even allowed to defend a dissertation in Lithuanian. As experience shows, the Lithuanians' position on this matter has prompted others to do the same. Cultural centers have been set up in Lithuania for Russians, Poles, Jews, Latvians, Karaims....

Then why the tension in social and political life in Lithuania, why the concern of veterans and many Communists? There are many reasons.

The point is that people of all manner of beliefs and philosophies are currently endeavoring to unite under the "Sajudis" banner. No effort is needed—call yourself a supporter of "Sajudis," and it is done. That is what many people are doing, even those who were recently stagnation apologists. Therefore, the leadership's declarations—intelligent and cultured—do not match the behavior of those lower down the scale. During mass measures "Sajudis" supporters have had no qualms about abusing both individuals and the authorities, drawing and sometimes printing slogans and placards which can serve no purpose except provocation. Moral pressure is frequently used during campaigns, actions, and the collection of signatures.

Here is a recent example: As the deputies were coming out onto the street after the Supreme Soviet session, pickets—reminiscent of a mob—hurled abuse at them for not voting for the "Sajudis" ultimatum. I want to dwell in particular on the events of recent weeks. The published draft laws had a cool and blatantly critical reception in Lithuania. I believe the problem is not only one of the content of the drafts but of the preparation of public opinion, of elucidation. The ideas of independence, self-management, and sovereignty for the union republics are very much alive at the moment, and when the first amendments to the USSR Constitution were confined to the "upper story," many people were disappointed. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo session and the explanations and assurances that followed reduced the tension somewhat. But by that time, on "Sajudis'" initiative, signatures were already being gathered demanding that the draft Constitution not be discussed at all at the upcoming Supreme Soviet session.

The latest explanations strengthened the positions of those who were in principle in favor of a discussion of the drafts and only criticized certain articles and wordings. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet session approved the provisions of the draft laws geared to democratization of the process of electing the supreme organs of state power and the formation of new representative USSR state organs. At the same time, the session expressed disagreement with the provisions which, it appeared to the session, contradicted the resolutions and purpose of the 19th Party Conference, and are geared to increasing centralization, limiting republics' sovereignty, and belittling the Leninist principles of federation.

The "Sajudis" leadership put forward a resolution proposing radical amendments to the Lithuanian Constitution, which signified confrontation with the existing USSR Constitution and nonimplementation of USSR laws. It was not supported by the deputies. This made the "Sajudis" leadership very unhappy, and it entered into open confrontation with the organs of power by demanding the convening of an extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet, and it started to pressure the deputies.

Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary A.K. Brazauskas appeared on television in this connection. Noting that the session had taken place under the sign of restructuring and in the spirit of fruitful debate and different opinions, and that really big steps forward had been taken in Lithuania recently, he explained how dangerous the "Sajudis" leadership's ultimatums and actions were.

"We understand that not all "Sajudis" intentions have been realized. Why, a political contest is taking place. Clearly, one must know how to lose. We lose sometimes, too. But in this situation it is necessary to understand the way events are developing, the logic of political decisions. It is very important not to inflame passions, not to embark on confrontation, but to try to consolidate forces."

A.K. Brazauskas appealed to deputies of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and USSR Supreme Soviet to be consistent and to be guided by political wisdom. He appealed to the entire Lithuanian population not to yield to the passions kindled by certain individuals, not to destroy but to build.

[Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 22 November, Second Edition, p 2, in a similar report adds: "Unfortunately, not everyone is heeding these sensible words. Yu. Gitsyavichyus, deputy to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and chief of Alitusskiy Rayon's "Dzukiya Kolkhoz Livestock Unit, announced that he had received complaints from three men, who were by the way not his voters and who insistently proposed that he sign a document opposing the decisions of the Supreme Soviet session.

A group of deputies from Vilkavishkis, who did not understand what was at issue, signed a comparable document but then revoked their signatures. Yesterday (that is, Monday) groups of people, including senior pupils acting on behalf of "Sajudis," tried to block transport at intersections at midday. This was called a "stop-action protest."

The great good of democracy. But democracy without responsibility may turn into evil. Violence clearly does not accord with the decisions of the 19th party conference, for whose implementation "Sajudis" is striving, as has been stated on several occasions."]

If the voice of reason is not heeded, it is hard to foresee the path into the future.

Aims, Methods Analyzed

PM1511151488 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent L. Kapelyushnyy report under the rubric "Learning Democracy": "The Movement, or The Need To Pool Efforts in the Struggle for Restructuring"]

[Text] Vilnius—The oaks planted one October night by candlelight and torchlight on Tauras hill will be growing for a long time. It will be a long time till they reach maturity, till the roots grow strong and the branches cease to fear the cold winds. Before that, very hard work lies ahead for all those who planted the grove as a long-term reminder to present and future generations and those who were simply present to applaud.

The oaks were planted by the delegates to the founding congress of the Lithuanian movement for restructuring, which is now called simply the movement ("Sajudis"). There are more than enough rumors (as distinct from information) about it. Therefore we must seek the answers to two questions. What kind of movement is it? In what direction is it moving? The second of this questions is perhaps even more interesting.

I wonder how my words will read, in, say, a year from now? Where could the spontaneous forces of "rally democracy" lead this comparatively small republic? Will the movement's leadership and the republic's leading organs feel their way toward controlling these very complex processes? Will the high expectations prove justified? Or will the gloomiest predictions be fulfilled? I do not know. I am not a prophet, nor a soothsayer—I am a journalist whose duty is to report what happens regardless of whether he likes the course of events or not. But I make no secret of my hopes that the movement will find the right path and not go astray.

The majority believes that the movement is amenable to reason and is capable of developing as a constructive force. Let us consider together what this depends on. I think here we need a brief excursion into the recent past, to June, when the Vilnius intelligentsia set up an initiative group (35 people) to organize the movement.

"The all-union party conference was approaching, passions were seething, and I personally sensed a danger that restructuring could, in nautical terms, make a sudden tack. The conservatives, who had seemed to be flagging, raised their heads, but now they were saying everything in the new way, while turning the rudder onto the old course. I was not the only one who sensed danger. In the first few days of June I was invited to a meeting at the Academy of Sciences. There were about 500 people in the auditorium...

"I came away from that meeting as a member of the initiative group." (Algimantas Chekuolis)

Three weeks later, on Gediminasa Square in the very center of Vilnius, the Lithuanian Communist Party delegation to the 19th all-union party conference was seen off. But how this sendoff differed from former sendoffs, with their farewell speeches delivered from scripts and their stereotyped assurances! This time a difficulty arose over the assurances. The mandates handed to the delegates were such that they found it a chilling experience not only to take them to Moscow, but even to accept them into their hands. The public was demanding for the republic economic autonomy, cultural sovereignty, the revival of national symbols and emblems, the status of state language for the native language, a review of the assessments of events in recent history, and so forth. According to yesterday's yardsticks, all this could only be called out-and-out nationalism.

One can understand how hard it was for Central Committee secretary Algirdas Brazauskas, who was in charge of industry then, to conduct a dialogue, on behalf of the bureau, with a rally of 20,000 people. Later he admitted that the yellow, green, and red banner that appeared somewhere in the far corner of the square had by no means delighted him...

Sometime in the future, researchers will be struck by the unusual dynamism of our time. The rapidity of the changes. The decisive breaking of stereotypes. The idea of economic autonomy, which had appeared "seditious," acquired legitimate rights at the party conference. Only a year ago a furious reader complained to me: IZVESTIYA's correspondent writes that at a rally at the Mickiewicz monument people sang folk songs, but in

fact they sang the nationalist anthem too! Nowadays "Lietuva, Our Fatherland..." is sung everywhere—it has been rehabilitated. And what of that gathering by the monument in August of last year, which I myself described as anti-Soviet, when rallies of a hundred thousand people are now meeting on the same issue. And no resolutions on manifestations of bourgeois nationalism.

Society is growing wiser. The blood-letting of democratism is washing away our orthodoxy of opinions. We are learning to be more tolerant, we are learning pluralism, we are learning to listen and to think.

It is hard work. Especially in view of the fact that everyone has to learn.

After that memorable rally, the telephone in the correspondents' office became red-hot, and it has not cooled down yet. After every new mass meeting, there is a new surge of calls. The founding congress was no exception. My callers can be divided into two categories. Some demand "resolute measures against surviving nationalists and their seed, which we have not fully rooted out." That, I think, is clear enough. The other question is more difficult: Why has tension arisen between the Russian-speaking population and the Lithuanians? What can non-Lithuanians expect when the Lithuanian language has been given the status of state language?

"Our aim is the democratization of public life, the safeguarding of civil rights and social justice, real sovereignty for the republic through the soviets and public organizations, and total glasnost.

"Our revival is not merely a matter of our destiny, and not merely the destiny of our neighbors—Latvia, Estonia, Belorussia, Russia. It is the destiny of Europe—the world, even. Today we understand very well: Where an individual is ailing, the people are ailing, and where a people is ailing, the world is ailing." (Romualdas Ozolas.)

It would be impossible to relate even cursorily the general program of the movement and the more than 20 resolutions adopted by the congress. But please take my word for it—R. Ozolas, one of the initiators and now a member of the movement's sejm and council, put forward an accurate formulation. And it accords if not in letter, then in spirit with the resolutions of the all-union party conference. I suppose the movement's unusual popularity is also due to the fact that without holding conferences or drawing up plans or other kinds of red tape and paperwork, its activists embarked on the immediate implementation of the party conference principles. And they received great support on this basis. Some 1,000 support groups in 4 months. Nearly 180,000 active participants. Some R170,000 collected for its own needs.

How far are the accusations of national extremism and egotism justified? Well, there is no smoke without fire. But as far as the movement's platform and its official position are concerned, it has adhered from the first to the principles of internationalism. The vast majority of the aktiv also adhere to these principles. I remember the roar of approval with which the 100,000-strong rally in Vingis Park greeted the words of one of the speakers: "The development of the society of all the people needs monitoring by all the people. There should be no place for nationalist or chauvinist sorties. The success of the restructuring of society in the republic is inconceivable without respect for the Russians, Poles, Jews, Belorussians, Karaims, and people of other nationalities living here."

Five months is not long. But many examples can be cited to confirm these words in practice. The movement now includes many Poles, Jews, and Russians. Incidentally, not one of the representatives of these nationalities who spoke at the congress mentioned the oppression of national minorities in Lithuania. And if we were to look at the "nationality" section of the general program (one of nine sections), we would see that the movement "condemns any lawlessness on ethnic grounds or belittling of national dignity, culture, and language."

"Everything that is happening in Lithuania should assume the forms of civic consensus. Guarantees of civic consensus. The Lithuanian and the non-Lithuanian are equal before the law. Only by following this path can we rally for Lithuania's good all the people who live in it, all the national minorities..." (Arvidas Yuozaytis)

These words are addressed first and foremost to Lithuanians. But I would like to single out for reflection another phrase—what is, in fact, happening in Lithuania, and what is impossible without a consensus of all citizens? Hundreds of slogans calling for restructuring rose on the crest of the waves of rally democracy. The word they used most was sovereignty. Most often in relation to the economy, and since in future this promises a general improvement in living standards and better supplies of food and consumer goods for Lithuania, all ethnic strata are in favor of it.

The economy should serve people, it cannot go against people's ecological, national, cultural, social, or demographic interests. This is achieved when the economy is managed by a proprietor with an interest in it. Therefore the movement places economic autonomy for Lithuania chief among its objectives.

But economic autonomy is only part of the program for gaining sovereignty. The movement demands total independence—from the introduction of Lithuanian money into circulation, to the creation of national military subunits and young people's fulfillment of their compulsory military service within Lithuania. We will not discuss the concept itself now—that is a matter for a separate discussion. What is important, it seems to me, is

the reaction to the formulation of the question. Certain exceptionally resolute people insist that Lithuania's demands, as a sovereign republic, be met without delay, otherwise—secession from the union...

For many years we have branded as a nationalist anyone who dared to place the interests of his own people and their culture not exactly higher than others, but closer to his heart... Yet ethnic relations were, at the same time, so deformed that the very concepts—national, international, sovereign—had begun to lose their original significance. The situation that has arisen now could provide a subject for serious study. People who lived side by side for decades, taking no notice of nationality, have suddenly begun to divide. Did it really only take a couple of dozen hotheads whispering old slogans like "Lithuania for the Lithuanians!" to destroy trust in the entire Lithuanian people?

At the congress there were only a few speeches containing extremist proposals. They were eagerly applauded by the gallery. After one of them, disrupting the proper order of the debates, Vitautas Petkyavichyus, one of the most active members of the initiative group with a reputation for the directness and trenchancy of his views, mounted the platform. Without beating about the bush, he called the appeal to secede from the union a provocation. And he was applauded too, but from the floor of the hall, where 1,127 delegates representing the people were sitting.

"Are ethnic relations really exacerbated here? And if so, who is to blame? The movement sprang up in early June. A month later the whole of Lithuania was flooded with a yellow, green, and red sea of national flags, which even we Lithuanians perceived as a wonder. So imagine how people who are not indigenous inhabitants of Lithuania must feel in this drastically altered situation. For them, not knowing our language or our history, regarding the words 'Soviet Union' and 'Russia' as synonymous, accustomed to being able to get by admirably with only the Russian language in Kirghizia, the Yakutia tundra, and Lithuania, it must feel as if they had suddenly wakened in a foreign country." (Virgiliyus Chepaytis.)

The 5 months have not been a rosy or tranquil period in the movement's history. Colors became intermingled, pluses changed to minuses, hopes alternated with disappointments. The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee formally recognized and approved the movement, but this recognition was still through clenched teeth. This is not the place to recall who was to blame for what, but it was basically the reluctance to accept the movement that caused the control of the situation in the republic to begin to slip from the Central Committee leadership's hands. Indecisiveness and a wait-and-see attitude exacerbated the situation with every day. In the end the bureau came to the conclusion that the former first secretary was unable to cope with the situation, and suggested that he resign—an unprecedented case. Here is why I am recalling this now. The movement burst into our life like a mountain stream rushing into a quiet valley. After the rain, after the thawing of the ice, its turbulent and rapid flow erodes the banks and carries off the trees. People who are unintelligent, who bear a grudge against the whole wide world, or who are dishonest have joined (and will continue to join) the movement. Their lack of restraint stands out a mile. And it prompts a reaction... The extremism of this minority within the movement is well and truly mixed with national narrow-mindedness and political ignorance. Again, this is not the place to analyze their slogans and proposals, but when that analysis is carried out, the antipopular, anti-Lithuanian essence of the loud talking resorted to by certain loud-mouthed orators will become apparent. In any case, the foreign journalists present at the congress, people who are used to everything, noted the ill-considered and petty nature of some of the proposals that aroused such stormy rapture in the gallery.

While measuring the formal creation of the movement as a matter of a few months, it must be said that thinking, uncompromising, and honest inhabitants of Lithuania had been moving toward organizing such a movement for decades. The movement cost the people much and means much to the people, and everyone must fight for it. The platform of pluralism, freedom of opinions, and democracy must not be used to compromise it. I am speaking not only on behalf of the alarmed national minorities, but also in the wake of the movement's leaders, priests, and party workers who are calling for prudence.

"Recognizing the movement's prestige, representatives of other ideological currents are also beginning to join it. Even now there are people seeking to be on the council of the future sejm who are capable of collecting votes successfully, but are hardly able to make a sober assessment of their own real potential..." (Antanas Burachas.)

Why has the movement spent five long and difficult months under the keen observation of party and soviet organs, but without assistance from them? Its popularity, activeness, the desire of the broad masses to become involved in restructuring caused some concern. It is paradoxical: The party announced restructuring and called on the masses to participate actively, but when they woke up and began to move, the party, in the shape of the republican party organization, lost the initiative.

I would venture to suggest that if the huge army of official ideologists and propagandists had boldly agreed to meet the movement, if it had found convincing words to debunk the extremists, if it had set up convincing facts against their hollow talk, we would not be talking about a mood of anxiety among the Russian-speaking population and a leftist threat to restructuring.

Today there have been drastic changes for the better. A welcome guest at the congress was the new Central Committee first secretary, Algirdas Brazauskas. As was the case during his first meeting, he did not flirt with the

masses. He called for the pooling of efforts, and his answer came in the form of ovations. He condemned extremism, thoughtlessness and haste in certain conclusions and demands, and labels—and the congress accepted the criticism.

And here I should not get too emotional... However popular the Central Committee first secretary may be, the movement will only embark firmly on the right path when everyone fights for it. When every first secretary of a raykom, gorkom, or primary organization has no fear of dialogue with the masses. When he speaks the truth. Defends the truth. When we have eradicated the ostrich habit of not raising urgent questions, however pressing they may be, but avoiding them or looking for explanations of what is inexplicable.

There have been different chapters in the brief history of our state. There are some we would like to forget. But the past, present, and future are connecting vessels. And the only way to rid ourselves of errors is to acknowledge them. Much has already been done in this direction, but a good deal still remains. The period 1940-1953 is still a bleeding wound for Lithuania and the other Baltic republics. Official historical science and Lithuanian historians are speaking different languages today.

Even rebuilding a single house involves much trouble. We have set about an immeasurably more difficult and important task. We want to do everything more quickly, resolutely, firmly. But everything must take its turn and proceed in order. Nature assigns its immutable term to the ripening of the grain, the birth of a child, the change from winter to summer, and this applies still more to the maturing and establishment of new social relations, where the diverse interests of millions of people clash. It is important to make our wishes commensurate with reality. What is needed is common sense, rather than beating your brains out against obstacles that it is proposed to remove in a short time. Is that any reason for ultimatums? The problems in society have accumulated over decades, and cutting through this knot by brute force is an old method that we ourselves have condemned. This applies both to particular aspects of the economic autonomy program and to the improvement of the legal system, constitutional amendments, and so forth.

It must also be said that it is inhuman and unjust to heap onto today's generation of both young and mature people the responsibility for crimes they did not commit, and to make them answerable for the Stalin regime. The union of our republics was created in difficult years, and there was not always gaiety and concord in our common home. But we, the ordinary citizens of our land, have always been people, have always shared bread and salt and helped one another. Fraternity, not merely for show, but based on the peoples' traditions and their moral ideas of good and evil, was the best and greatest gain of the Union. It is our great good fortune that Lithuania and Estonia have not been struck in recent years by earthquakes, typhoons, tornadoes, or other disasters. It is our great good fortune that the Lithuanians were not helped by all the republics, but that Lithuanians, together with all the peoples, helped the Georgians, Uzbeks, and Russians. But can anyone imagine that if, God forbid, some disaster did strike, the Lithuanians or their neighbors would be left alone in their suffering?

A nation's greatness is not defined by its numbers or territory, but by the nobility of its goals and the methods by which those goals are sought. One can only welcome the desire for democratization of society and intolerance of bureaucracy and other legacies from past times. But ultimatums, labels, the compilation of "postscript lists" ["postskriptsionnyye spiski"], and demands for an official to resign without sufficient reason hardly constitute the democratic path. Respect for the individual and his honor and dignity is an essential condition of the creation of a rule-of-law state. Is that always how the movement operates? In one rayon I saw a movement group trying to impose its will on the delegates to the rayon party conference. A number of the demands were contrary to the CPSU Statutes, and the ultimatum tone was not far short of shameless. Seeing the delegates' reluctance to do its bidding and satisfy its demands, the picket started chanting offensive slogans and calling them "stagnation delegates."

"Am I a representative of stagnation?" a kolkhoz tractor driver asked, seething with indignation. "I spend all my life tilling the land and sowing the grain so that they can get on with their jobs quietly. And what good did they do me yesterday? What good are they doing me today?"

"It is incumbent on us not only to criticize, but also to think what to do to ensure that things are no longer as they were. We should propose our own solutions to social problems and listen to our opponents' arguments. Our demands should be concrete and clear... The participants in the movement cannot be passive observers and critics." (Bronyus Genzyalis.)

One of the speakers, a grain grower, speaking at the congress, showed the audience a horseshoe and reminded them that they are always lucky. Applause, approving laughter—the allegory pleased them. But the country boy had his own ideas. What is a horseshoe, he asked, and what use is it to a practical man? In addition to a horseshoe, you need a horse and cart. And the movement will be able to serve the people if it acquires its "horse and cart."

Coming back to the oaks that will be growing and gaining strength for a long time, it is important not to leave them uncared for. And the same is true of the progressive ideas with which the movement has entered our eventful times. Their growth and maturation will take much greater efforts than caring for the oak grove. But they themselves have chosen this lot, and I can only repeat the poet's words: "It is difficult work—the motherland."

'Sajudis' Member Interviewed

LD1811071488 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1830 GMT 16 Nov 88

[No video available]

[Text] It began on 3 June. The first founding congress was held on 22 October. Sajudis—at present this name still does not mean much to us. It means "movement" in Lithuanian. So what is this Lithuanian movement for restructuring?

[Begin recording] [Sajudis member Jakubas Minkevicius, in Polish] We have a program. This program was discussed at our founding congress. First and foremost we are striving for our republic's sovereignty.

[Unidentified reporter] How do you interpret the concept of sovereignty of Lithuania?

[Minkevicius] Sovereignty with a federation of Soviet republics. We are supported by very wide circles of all our nationalities, not just the Lithuanians. And we collaborate with those economic and political structures which already exist. These structures used to be quite conservative and we are now adding dynamism.

[Reporter] The movement enjoys tremendous support among the inhabitants of Lithuania.

[Minkevicius] It is very popular. We have probably never in our history had such a popular and mass movement as this one.

[Reporter] What determines this popularity? Is it that the movement is national in nature, or is it that it is working for restructuring?

[Minkevicius] Both the former and latter equally—that it is for the national cause and for restructuring, for a social policy of justice and the renascence of our nationality. [end recording]

More on 22 Oct Congress

LD2111152488 [Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0935 GMT on 22 October continues its live relay from the constituent congress of the Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring in the Vilnius Sports Palace [please see Vilnius Radio report published in the 31 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 50-54].

Following the speech by Vytautas Petkevicius, Andrey Voznesenskiy, a well-known Russian poet, was invited to take the floor.

In his speech, Voznesenskiy expresses his full support to the congress' cultural and national program. In conclusion he reads a poem dedicated to Marcinkevicius, a Lithuanian poet, in which he expresses regret for the harm and sorrow inflicted on Lithuania by Stalin and the Molotov-Ribbentrop secret pact. Voznesenskiy says that his people, the Russians, have also suffered at the hands of their beloved leader and are therefore worse off.

Kestutis Urba, treasurer of the congress, questions the financial stability of Lithuania. "Are we strong financially?" he asks. He goes on to say that on 3 June, when the movement was set up by the initiative group, the members of this group donated R131. After the meeting in Gediminas Square to see off the delegates to the 19th party conference, R3,010 were donated by supporters.

At the next rally in Vingis Park, the people donated some R28,000. On 23 August some R25,000 were donated to the congress. Urba goes on to detail how the money was spent. He says that an account has been opened at a bank in Vilnius which has a present balance of R167,497.

Following Urba's report, Petkevicius reads out some telegrams. A break is then announced for lunch until 1200 GMT. This was followed by a concert and then a repeat of a speech by Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee at the opening of the conference.

At 1205 GMT the conference resumes. Prof Kazimieras Antanavicius takes the floor. He begins his speech by describing the past, the present, and the future, and the objectives which the united nation will have in order to get out of the pit. He says: "The flag alone is not enough for us—we also need sausage, cheese, love, and the truth."

Antanavicius adds: "It is not party committees who express the will of the people but the local soviets. Therefore, it is the local soviet which should have the power and not the party committees. The time has come when only people who represent the opinion of the people, who represent their interests, should be elected as people's deputies."

In conclusion, Antanavicius says that people should get rid of fear and start believing that a united nation can achieve the goals at which restructuring aims.

Following Antanavicius, Jurgis Petkus, a historian from Kaunas, is invited to the floor. He begins his speech by saying:

"The issue of state sovereignty is one of the pressing problems in Lithuania today. After long decades of violence and oppression the awakening nation is resolutely striving for freedom. These aspirations can be crowned only by the absolute and full state sovereignty, unrestricted by any ambiguous links of dependence and obligations.

"In order to have a complete picture of the problem of the Lithuanian sovereignty and events which took place between Lithuania and Russia, one must make a short trip back into Lithuania's history."

Petkus says that in 1918 Lithuania was declared independent. Russia wanted to retain Lithuania as part of its empire and for this purpose a provisional government headed by Vincas Kapsukas was established. He then reminds the audience that in 1920 Soviet Russia signed a treaty with Lithuania and renounced its rights to Lithuania's sovereignty or territory forever.

Petkus goes on to speak in detail on the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, the secret proposals, and events that followed. He says: "On 15 June 1940, the USSR delivered an ultimatum, sent a large contingent of troops into Lithuanian territory, and overthrew the constitutional government of Lithuania. Then a puppet government was set up which by virtue of fraud established the so-called Seimas and with the help of this Seimas, incorporated Lithuania into the USSR.

"Therefore, the USSR Government became an aggressor in respect of Lithuania—it occupied the country and buried Lithuania's state sovereignty."

Petkus then describes the Stalinist terror which reigned until Hitler attacked the USSR, and which later resumed during the post-war years. Describing these events, Petkus says that industrialization of the country was forcefully introduced and the social-demographic structure was changed. Petkus says that these policies led the country to the brink of ecological catastrophe.

On the restructuring started in Moscow, Petkus says that at the beginning people viewed it with scepticism, saying that one cannot expect anything good from Moscow.

Describing the present-day situation in Lithuania, Petkus says: "Winning back our flag is the first step to state sovereignty." "Stalinism is still very strong within the system of this empire. On 28 September Stalin's ghost appeared again and woke the dragon; once again the boots of Beriya's shock troops trampled upon the faces of our people; they tried to beat the desire for liberty out with batons."

In conclusion Petkus says: "The question now arises: How long will the nation have to endure violence and international banditry? Is there no guarantee which would ensure safe and democratic ways to freedom and sovereignty? This guarantee is our unity, and our resolute and firm determination to win freedom and independence.

"We have only one objective—the independence of the state in unity with all Soviet nations, in unity based on mutual respect and confidence and not on oppression and bondage of slavery. Therefore, we appeal to all nationalities living here with us in Lithuania and in our neighborhood: Let us respect one another and let us be tolerant toward one another. Let us not strive for hegemony, because it gives rise to slavery and hatred. Let us adopt a common slogan: For our and your freedom!"

D. Varkalys, a delegate from Klaipeda, takes the floor. He begins his speech by appealing for help to save certain industrial enterprises closed down in Klaipeda because of the pollution problem. Klaipeda goes on to speak about the Klaipeda School of Navigation, where, he says, out of 90 students in their 1st year, only 15 were Lithuanians. Later these students left the school because of the Russification policies adopted by the school. Varkalys says that out of 600 students this year, only 12 were Lithuanians. Without any exceptions, all Lithuanian graduates were sent to work in the Far East, while the Russians remained in Klaipeda, he says.

Varklays concludes by appealing to those who helped to carry out Stalin's policies to give up their privileged life, their awards, and names of honor without waiting for people to do this for them.

Following Varkalys, an unidentified delegate from Belorussia takes the floor. He says: "Dear brother Lithuanians! Let me convey heartfelt greetings from the people of Belorussia. We likewise also suffer from the yoke of bureaucratism and want to overthrow it. Nowadays, bureacratism has become a counterrevolution of restructuring.

"Therefore, in Grodno, Western Belorussia, and in Minsk and some other cities, committees have been set up in order to protect restructuring.

"On 15 October the ice was broken; a decision was made by a majority of votes at a meeting which took place in the oblast's house of political education in Minsk to establish a National Front in Belorussia.

"We have an important request to put to you: Support your brother Belorussians and express in your resolution overwhelming support to Belorussians in establishing their National Front. The Belorussian people do not see any other way out of stagnation other than to set up a National Front in the republic."

The next to speak is Gytis Padegimas, a delegate from Siauliai. Padegimas begins by speaking about the destruction of churches in the republic, giving specific instances of this type of act. He goes on to speak about the needs of those living in rural areas. He says that people should not be left out of the congress.

Speaking of the genetic code of the nation, Padegimas calls on the government to make public all figures about mentally ill children in the republic.

Padegimas appeals for help and support in the campaign against the military commissariats who, together with other government organs, use repression against the

people of Lithuania while sending our people to work as slave labor at various installations of the national economy. He says that during the summer these people are kept in prison conditions. He also calls for removing military bases stationed near cities and in the cities, calling them a repeated commission of Stalinism.

Padegimas says that the Siauliai "Sayudas" group adopted a resolution of no-confidence in Jonas Lukauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR People's Control Committee. He also indicates the reasons for this, saying that during the period between 1975 and 1985, Jonas Lukauskas worked as a party official in Siauliai and proved to be a hardline Stalinist and Brezhnevist. Therefore, he compromised himself and consequently he cannot remain in his high- ranking government post.

Gintaras Songaila, member of the commission to prepare the "Sajudis" statute, then speaks, announcing several proposals concerning membership and dues to the "Sajudis." Songaila is followed by Viktoras Lukosevicius from Panevezys who condemns river pollution and waste deriving from industry being subordinated to all-union control. He praises the new legislation in Lithuanian—civil rights, media independence etc. and appeals for the republic to be granted the possibility of receiving television programs from other union republics and from abroad.

At approximately 1300 GMT a recess is declared during which a music and dance presentation is staged. Reception of the relay deteriorates to unmonitorable at about 1330 GMT precluding further processing.

More on RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session

LD2111230788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2050 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] A session of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on 21 November examined the course of the discussion in the republic of the USSR draft Laws "On Changes and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Fundamental Law)" and "On the Election of People's Deputies of the USSR". The Presidium adopted the relevant decision.

It was proposed that the presidiums of the supreme soviets and the councils of ministers of the autonomous republics, the executive committees of kray, oblast, Moscow and Leningrad City Soviets of People's Deputies should, on conclusion of the discussion of the drafts of these laws, sum up the results of this work, carefully analyze all the proposals and remarks received from work collectives, public organizations and citizens, including those aimed at eliminating shortcomings in the work of local soviet and economic bodies, and take these proposals into account in their practical activity.

The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet considers that the amendments to the Constitution and certain other legislative acts adopted by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet run counter to the basic principles of socialist federalism enshrined in the Constitution of the Soviet Union and do not facilitate the development of our single multi-ethnic state.

The session of the presidium considered certain other matters of state life of the republic. The session was conducted by Comrade Vorotnikov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Estonian Peoples Front's Nurm Interviewed

PM2211100688 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 18 Nov 88 p3

["E.M." interview with Estonian Peoples Front leader Hasso Nurm; date, place not given]

[Text] Moscow—"Parliament has spoken and sovereign Estonia is born. Note, however, that this does not mean that we intend to separate from the USSR. All we have in mind is the opportunity to live happily in our own land. However, it is we who must decide what happiness is." Hasso Nurm, leader of the Tallinn Peoples Front, spent the night at a meeting and after the soviet's vote did not speak of victory but announced a further period of battle. Nurm explained to LA REPUBBLICA what the Front wants to achieve and why it has declared war on Gorbachev's new constitution.

[Interviewer] Engineer Nurm, what is the point of this declaration of sovereignty for Estonia, within the rigid confines of the USSR?

[Nurm] Its purpose is the reinstatement and exercise of one of our people's rights. The USSR's constitution envisages the republics' sovereignty—but only in words, because there is no law that permits this principle's specific implementation. We are filling this gap.

[Interviewer] How can Estonia's sovereignty be exercised?

[Nurm] We have introduced the first real legislative act that will serve as an instrument to guarantee the exercise of sovereignty: This is the decision to submit all the USSR's laws to prior approval by our own soviet before their implementation in Estonia. With this constitutional rule, this is the first time in Soviet history that a republic has priority over the Union.

[Interviewer] What do you expect from the USSR Supreme Soviet, which will have to rule on this measure?

[Nurm] A long and bitter battle that will last perhaps a year, perhaps even two. But for the first time the final outcome of this battle could be positive.

[Interviewer] Do you not believe that your self-proclamtion of autonomy will be rejected without appeal, as was that of Nagorno-Karabakh?

[Nurm] Perhaps. It depends on Moscow—but it depends on us too.

[Interviewer] Why did you totally reject the draft reform of the USSR Constitution?

[Nurm] Because that reform reduces the republics' rights to a minimum. Since we cannot influence the USSR Constitution—beyond our negative vote—we decided to change our own republican constitution. It is the only way we can escape this reduction of sovereignty.

[Interviewer] You have always supported perestroyka. Does the constitutional battle mark the end of the Front's backing for Gorbachev?

[Nurm] No. We can understand Gorbachev, even now. In a situation in which perestroyka is not moving forward he needs to impose it. To do so he must have all the power in his own hands. We understand all this—but we cannot accept something that is bad for our republic for the sake of perestroyka.

[Interviewer] What do you have in mind?

[Nurm] For instance, Gorbachev talks about land leasing, but our peasants want land, not leases. They feel as though they have been duped for the past 40 years. We say that it is right for the land to belong to the peasants. We will not take it away: It will remain in the USSR, but it will belong to the peasants.

[Interviewer] What did the Politburo's envoy, Viktor Chebrikov, propose?

[Nurm] He and Lukyanov gave us to understand that these changes are needed now but that in the near future our rights will be restored. But how can we explain this to our people after 40 years of broken promises?

[Interviewer] Will there really be negotiations to discuss Estonian-USSR relations?

[Nurm] Inevitably. They have a political significance, but above all an economic significance. The present system does not permit a real republican self-financing program. Estonia's relations with the other republics and the USSR must, however, be negotiated and established individually, with negotiated terms of agreement and exchange. This is a solid foundation for an understanding—the only one possible, unless there is a desire to witness a growth of the 'syndrome of mistrust' that is making headway among us.

Estonian Premier on Language, Citizenship Issues

PM2211113288 Rome AVANTI! in Italian
19 Nov 88 p 16

[Unattributed interview with Indrek Toome, chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers; date, place not given]

[Text] AVANTI! put some questions concerning the situation in Estonia to the new Estonian prime minister, Indrek Toome, who is also a member of the Estonian Communist Party Secretariat.

[Interviewer] Apparently many people in the USSR find some of your Supreme Soviet's demands—such as for the proclamation of Estonian as the state language and the introduction of Estonian citizenship—too radical.

[Interviewer] In my opinion these demands are consistent with the All-Union CPSU Conference's decisions on relations between the various nationalities. The resolution asserted the need to develop national languages, to defend the individual republics' original populations, to extend their sovereign rights in the management of both federal and their own affairs. Language and citizenship have been artificially wrested from the body of other signs of national identity—the common territory and common political and economic conditions of citizens living in this land.

Of course, not everyone likes our attitude, just as not everyone likes perestroyka. For a long time we were educated on the basis of the principle of a false internationalism—the Stalinist concept of internationalism, which actually meant nothing other than assimilation. Fortunately when we began perestroyka we realized that we would eventually kill socialism unless we recognized the multinational nature of our situation, unless we perceived the existence of varied interests, including those of the individual nationalities. Only free men and free and equal nations can really be friends.

The problems of language and citizenship are complex, and we examined them during the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum. The recognition of Estonian as the national language within the republic will be enshrined in the Estonian Constitution very soon, through the introduction of an amendment to this effect. On this I also agree with the representatives of the other nationalities present in the republic. Of course there are anxieties, but they will subside once the laws governing the use of languages in Estonia are approved. Of course Russian will remain the inter-ethnic language. We are, after all, an integral part of the USSR.

[Interviewer] What about the introduction of Estonian citizenship?

[Toome] The Estonian Constitution states that all the republic's citizens are citizens of the USSR. So what does it mean to be a citizen of the Estonian SSR? How does

this relate to the status of citizen of the USSR? What are the rights and duties of our citizens? We have put these questions to scholars and will in the future submit proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet, since we believe that the decision must concern not only Estonian but all the republics. So it will take time and there will have to be amendments to the USSR Constitution, and the question of participation in elections will have to be settled. Among other things, there must be regulations governing migratory trends. The current situation is abnormal, whereby unreasonable numbers of workers are imported for the sake of an erroneous policy on the part of central ministries, to increase production, without the knowledge of local authorities and without taking account of social, demographic, and environmental factors.

[Interviewer] What is the status of relations between the Estonian Communist Party and the People's Front?

[Toome] The Estonian Communist Party Central Committee reached the conclusion that to democratize society, to unite people in support of a broad platform of perestroyka, it is necessary to support the creation of a people's front, or in general of any social movement professing the desire to contribute to the processes of renewal. The basic principles of the Front's plans do not conflict, but actually coincide, with the broad outlines of perestroyka: democratization, glasnost, economic calculations. Of course it is possible to argue—as we do—with individual proposals by the Front; it can be accused of producing many words and few deeds at the moment. Of course, in a mass movement such as the Front ideas and proposals can occur that do not please everyone: me, for instance. However, there must be only one way of expressing disagreement: debate, discussion, persuasion, and explanation. Many people still await decisions from above. But if people always wait to see what will come from Moscow perestroyka will perish. The time has come for initiatives and autonomy.

Greens Movement in Estonia Detailed

LD1011061588 Moscow TASS in English 0539 GMT 10 Nov 88

[Text] Tallinn November 10—By ETA Correspondent Karin Luts:

Peaceful fields and meadows of the Rakvere district in Estonia, now turned white by the first snow of the early winter, were in the focus of heated debates last summer at rallies and meetings which were held by the Estonian Greens movement and which drew thousands of people.

A rich phosphorite deposit discovered there was included by a number of federal ministries in development plans.

However, extraction of phosphorites near Tallinn and the lack of up-to-date protection and purification facilities would have ruined one of the most fertile areas in the republic.

Besides, dozens of small rivers, feeding the stony podzolic soil of south Estonia, originate in that area. Their contamination with sulphuric acid production waste would result in droughts and crop failures in a bigger part of Estonia.

The Greens' victory over the bureaucratic apparatus of ministries, concerned above all with their own interests, was hailed by broad sections of the Estonian population.

Many people in Tallinn and other cities and towns of Estonia take part in actions initiated by the environmentalists.

Every week, they plant trees in new residential areas, clean lawns and gutters, and help municipal and forestry staff members.

The Greens participate in large-scale actions held by scientists and the republican state committee for nature conservation.

Next spring, Estonian environmentalists will take part in a campaign of 11 Baltic countries against the contamination of the Baltic Sea.

The Soviet Union is a member of the Helsinki Commission for the Protection of the Baltic Sea Water.

Estonian hydrologist Harald-Adam Velner was one of the leaders of that intergovernmental organisation in the last four years.

Although Estonia is a small republic with an area of a little more than 45,000 square kilometres, the extensive method of economic management has affected many areas in it.

The extraction of shale in mines and open pits in north east Estonia made the area look like a moonscape stretching for several kilometres.

Industrial districts of Tallinn and Maardu, where pulp-and-paper and chemical factories continue contaminating the air, are described by ecologists as unhealthy.

Electric power plants in the city of Narva are also hazardous for nature and people's health.

The Greens have many problems to solve in cities where residential and administrative buildings are often built to the detriment of the greenery.

The Lahemaa national part and the Kadriorg part laid out way back in the 18th Century by Russian Emperor Peter the Great require man's care.

Starting discussions on ecological problems at rallies, in newspapers, on radio and television and inviting senior executives of various departments, scientists, specialists and the public to take part in them, the Greens try to convince every citizen that nature conservation is a task of everyone and that the Green colour is a colour of survival.

Only reasonable development of progress can do good, they say.

The Estonian Greens movement recently adopted an emblem and flag of its own.

The flag depicts the human heart and the letter 'R' (the first letter of the Estonian word 'Roheline' meaning Greens) against a white background symbolising purity of intentions.

Representatives of Estonia participated under this flag in an annual international conference of Greens, held early in October in Krakow, Poland.

The Estonian Greens were the first republican movement to be admitted to the organisation Friends of the [word Indistinct] International, uniting Greens of 33 Countries.

This is a real recognition of achievements of the Estonian Greens and their contribution to the preservation of nature and life on earth.

Georgia Demonstrations Oppose Federal Reforms

AU2111161988 Paris AFP in English 1603 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow, Nov 21 (AFP)—Several thousand people demonstrated this weekend in two Georgian towns against proposed reforms to the Soviet Federal Constitution and in support of local demands, a dissident source said here Monday.

A total of 5,000 people held two demonstrations Sunday in the Black Sea town of Batumi, Zviyad Gamsakhurdiya, one of the leading spokesmen for Georgian dissidents, told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE.

The demonstators, mostly Christians, made political, religious and environmental demands.

They called for an end to administrative control by the autonomous republic of Adjari, a region dominated by Moslems, the reopening of a Georgian church and the closing of an oil refinery which, they said, caused severe damage to the environment.

About 20,000 people later marched through city streets, the source said.

On Saturday, about 5,000 people, mostly students, demonstrated in the town of Kutaysi, the second most important town in Georgia, against proposals to reform the Soviet Constitution which, they believe, will curtail the rights of individual republics.

These reforms are to be debated by the Supreme Soviet on November 29.

Another demonstration was due to be held Wednesday in the capital Tbilisi, the source said.

Georgian Party Central Committee Plans Staff Cut

LD2211144088 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 22 Nov 88

[Text] Tbilisi November 22 TASS—The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia at its plenary meeting today discussed questions of enhancing political leadership and delineating functions of party committees and state and economic bodies.

The plenum approved a new structure of the republican party committee staffs by taking into account constructive proposals from local organizations and individuals.

The staff of the Central Committee is to be cut by thirty per cent. Eight departments will replace the existing 17.

The released functionaries will be sent to local party government and economic bodies and public organizations. Their experience, skill and organizing abilities will be taken into account in job allocation.

The Central Committee found it advisory to form five commissions, ideological, on issues of organizational party and personnel work, social and economic development, agro-industrial complex and implementation of legal reform.

Georgia's Museum on Stalin Closes Down

LD1911163388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1633 GMT 19 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow, 19 Nov (TASS)—In September of this year the Stalin Museum in Gori (Georgia) was closed, TRUD newspaper reported today.

It was set up in 1957 as a museum of peoples' friendship but effectively became a Stalin museum.

"It is hard to say as yet what the new exhibition of the Gori museum will be," writes the paper, citing a report by the Georgian Culture Ministry. "It can only be asserted with confidence that it will show documents giving an objective account of Stalin and Stalinism."

Armenian, Latvian Supreme Soviet Sessions Open

LD2211102588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0901 GMT 22 Nov 88

[Text] Sessions of the Supreme Soviets of the Armenian and Latvian Union Republics have started today in Yerevan and Riga. Plans and budgets for next year are being discussed.

A plenum of the Novosibirsk party obkom is today discussing the draft progress report of the obkom at an oblast party conference.

Armenian Supsov Session Topics

NC2211115988 Yerevan Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 22 Nov 88

[Text] The 8th session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet began its work today in the Stepan Shaumyan political education hall. The following topics have been submitted to the deputies for their consideration:

—Organizational issues;

—State plan for economic and social development of the Armenian SSR for 1989 and results from fulfillment of the 1988 plan;

—State budget of the Armenian SSR for 1989 and fulfillment of the state budget for 1987;

—Progress in the fulfillment by the republic's soviet and economic organs of resolutions by the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the Council of Ministers of the USSR on measures for accelerating socio-economic development in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast;

—Draft law of the Armenian SSR on the nationwide dsicussion of important state issues;

—Ratification of the decrees of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR.

On a motion from Deputy Grant Voskanyan, the chairman of the presidium of the supreme soviet of the Armenian SSR, the decision on comments and proposals on the USSR draft laws on amendments and supplements to the USSR Constitution and on the election of people's deputies of the USSR has been submitted for debate by the session.

The session is continuing its work.

Further on Armenian Session

NC2211102588 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1000 GMT 22 Nov 88

[Summary from poor reception] "As you already know from our reports, the 8th session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet opened today at the Stepan Shaumyan Hall." In their speeches the deputies reported on activities since the last session. The session's discussions concerned "organizational issues," the republic's social and economic development, the 1988 and 1989 state budgets, the recognition of the 24 April [1915] crime, the "implementation by the soviet and economic bodies of the decisions approved by the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers," and other issues.

"Acting on the proposal of Deputy Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium," various draft laws were discussed.

New Monthly Newspaper Appears in Yerevan

LD1811212588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Nov 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Summary] The first issue of a new monthly newspaper entitled ERKKHOSUTYUN has come off the presses in Yerevan's Leninskiy Rayon. Its aim is to promote "frank contacts between the rayon's inhabitants and executive authorities."

Unauthorized Construction Work in Armenia

NC2111134588 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 18 Nov 88

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] A report by Azerinform in the newspapers notes that people in Azerbaijan SSR have been disturbed by the recent effort made by cooperative workers affiliated with the (?Kanakiri Aliyeyev) factory in the Armenian SSR to carry out unauthorized construction work in an area known as Tophana, which is near Shusha. The participants of the meetings that have been held in Baku have urged the republic's government to take effective measures to halt construction work in areas known for their natural beauty and historical importance.

Measures are being put into effect to halt construction work in Tophana. Leading officials from a number of ministries and main administrations are in the rayon.

Meanwhile, the report also said that the office of inquiry that was set up by the USSR procurator's office in Nagorno-Karabakh [NKAO] has finished investigating the crimes that have been committed in that oblast. The accounting and election meetings in the primary party

organizations and party conferences by the NKAO obkom, raykoms, and gorkoms have been postponed until the situation in that oblast stabilizes.

On the other hand, Professor Dzhamshidov, doctor of philological sciences, and Professor Fuad Aliyev, doctor of historical sciences, have published historical information on Tophana in KOMMUNIST under the rubric: Tophana Is A Monument Which Serves the People.

Culture Official Peters' 18 Nov Speech in Riga

LD2011235888 [Editorial Report] Riga in Latvian to Europe at 0830 GMT on 20 November, in its "Amber Coast" program, reports on the 18 November gathering in Riga's National Theater, where, on 18 November 1918, the State of Latvia was proclaimed.

In the introduction to the gathering, the newly elected chairman of the Committee of Culture, the composer Raimonds Pauls greets the participants in the name of the Latvian SSR State Committee of Culture: "Here at the National Theater, on this day and in this place, after 700 years of oppression under the yoke of foreigners, on 18 November 1918 the Republic of Latvia was proclaimed."

The announcer then explains that guests have congregated there and later also television viewers throughout Latvia had been shown this, "in order for the gathering to throw light on a moment not mentioned for a long time in our conception of history—18 November 1918." The announcer mentions the significance of this date: the proclamation of Latvia and the national identity of the peoples living in Latvia. The announcer says that answers to these and other questions were obtained "in the first part of the concert, when we heard several addresses." The announcer then introduces a recorded excerpt from the speech by the poet Janis Peters, head of the Council of Culture of Creative Unions.

Peters states: "We shall unlock our historical memory tonight with the key of art. Yes, tonight, on 18 November, with songs and poetry, with an appeal to socialist ideals, and with the words of God. But tomorrow we must be ready not only to ascertain misfortunes and tragedies, but also to offer to our people and to our government ideas on how to tackle the development of Latvia's democracy in future mutual relations with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and foreign countries.

"The sovereignty of Latvia, its juridical foundations, can be proclaimed only in the event of adherence to the proposals of the republic's workers, peasants, technical and creative intelligentsia, and also of the thinking forces in the Communist Party of Latvia and in the People's Front of Latvia, submitted to the republic's supreme soviet 22 November session and to the 29 November USSR Supreme Soviet session."

Peters then talks about "The former citizens of the Republic of Latvia" visiting Latvia this fall, saying that they are no longer just buying commemorative dish towels or washing their eyes at a well. Peters states: "Our fellow countrymen are offering actual assistance and cooperation to their people in Latvia." He continues, saying that poets, artists, scientists and actors receive recognition from their people in Latvia—everyday, in Latvia, they receive letters of love and admiration, proposals to establish or to renew contacts. He says that International PEN Club representatives and members of the Baltic German Cultural Society also write.

Peters then states: "Journalists and diplomats from Western countries come here. Latvia is returning to Europe.

"The state of Latvia commemoprates not only an anniversary. The state of Latvia is the balance sheet of our republic's economic accountability, in which Latvians living in the West can also invest.

"Without economic sovereignty there will be no other kind of sovereignty, and waving the flag alone is not enough. Only economic logic will enable us to live logically."

"Peasants who will attain the feeling of being a master by plowing the land in an agro-firm, collective farm or an individual farm homestead will ensure a full table for their people. If anybody is estranged by forces which are hostile to the land of Latvia, if they deny us this feeling of being a master then they themselves will suffer, because Latvia's peasants will no longer feed them.

"The workers, having obtained technology and tools worthy of the 20th century will create, in their turn, an economically logical industry. Such an industry will be capable of managing without recruiting workers in other regions, because this will be a modern industry with a high level of intensification. The need to discuss border closures will become superfluous, because there will simply be no need in Latvia for guest workers. But where there will be no need for people driven by despair to leave their native land, then there the population will be stabilized and nationality relations will achieve a new quality.

"Will it be like that at some time? It must be like that.

"In this period of history these are our concrete goals, this is our Castle of Light [referring to a well known choir song about the Castle of Light which will rise again one day], and it can also be called restructuring, in which currently all of our people have joined.

"The red-white-red flag and "God Bless Latvia" are our signs of identity. But may we live through the first intoxication of freedom with open eyes and with political farsightedness.

"Our people have never lacked heroic fighters, good dairy-farmers and talented artists. Our people lack statesmen and in a discipline such as diplomacy we have not displayed any particularly brilliant qualities. But if we are thinking about the sovereign future of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic, about Peoples' freedom and self determination, about a humane way for all Latvia's peoples to live together, then we must be capable of safeguarding our current leaders in the country—in the government, the party, the People's Front, and also in those ethnic groups which make Latvia strong, , and who base their destiny in Latvia on a rebirth of the rights of the Latvian nation."

With this conclusion of the excerpt from Peters speech the announcer then talks about the invitations to the gathering, which were sent in 11 languages. There follows a discussion on how other nationalities view the destiny of the Latvian people, a poetry reading and a song.

The program concludes with the gathering finale: A poem on difficult times and the singing of "God Bless Latvia."

Komsomol Central Committee Plenum Reported
PM2211093388 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 88 p 1

["Information Report on the Komsomol Central Committee Fourth Plenum"—KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA headline]

[Text] On 19th November the Fourth Plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee continued its work.

Questions raised and proposals submitted at the plenum were discussed during the morning sessions of the commissions working on the elaboration of the draft resolution and other plenum documents.

At the plenary session the discussion of the report was continued. Taking part in the debate were G. Seleznev, chief editor of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA; G. Poleshchuk, chief of a scientific research group at the "Katalizator" intersectorial scientific and technological complex of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Branch (Novosibirsk); I. Chernykh, first secretary of the Tula Komsomol Obkom; A. Degtyarev, first secretary of Tyumen Oblast Yamalo-Nenetskiy Komsomol Okrug Committee; Z. Apresyan, chief editor of the journal MOLODOY KOMMUNIST; V. Tyagliy, secretary of the Azerbaijan Komsomol Central Committee; R. Abdukadyrov, fitter-installation worker at the "Tashkentskiy Traktornyy Zavod Imeni 50-letiya SSR" Production Association; R. Karimov, instructor at the Komsomol Central Committee Komsomol Organs Department; N. Novodvorskaya, student at the Kustanay No 12 Secondary School; and D. Saltsev, student at the No 13 Secondary Vocational Technical School in Magnitogorsk, Chelyabinsk Oblast.

The concluding speech was delivered by V. Mironenko, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee.

The Komsomol Central Committee Fourth Plenum adopted a resolution which notes that the work carried out since the 20th Komsomol Congress in the restructuring and democratization of the Komsomol, improvement of the moral and ethical atmosphere within the union, and the firm establishment of glasnost is largely in line with the demands of the 19th all-union party conference. However, the process of transformations in the Komsomol is beset with contradictions and lacks depth and consistency. The absence of democratic traditions and experience and the unreadiness of a certain section of cadres and the aktiv to accept and understand innovations are telling. Vestiges of conservative, bureaucratic attitudes and stereotyped thinking persist.

The Komsomol Central Committee Plenum participants support the stance of the 19th all-union party conference that it is necessary to fully restore the Leninist principles of the party leadership of the Komsomol and observance of its organizational independence; they favor political and ideological leadership by the party but are opposed to petty tutelage and administration by edict.

It was emphasized at the plenum that Komsomol committees must persistently seek to master political methods of work and experience in the exercise of democracy and to consistently expand the Komsomol's opportunities in taking part in the administration of the state.

The Komsomol Central Committee favors the rallying and cohesion of Komsomol and nonunion youth in the struggle for restructuring. Attention is drawn to the enhanced role of Komsomol organizations in strengthening friendship and fraternal mutual assistance between the peoples of the USSR, and strengthening and further developing a united federal multinational state. At the same time it was stressed that it is necessary to denounce all activities aimed at undermining the socialist foundations, the kindling of national strife, and eroding the organizational unity of the Komsomol.

A pointed discussion was held at the Komsomol Central Committee plenum on the need to improve the work of elective organs and create conditions for primary Komsomol organizations which will enable them to really exercise their rights. There was support for proposals to set up public formations with a professional and social profile at Komsomol committtees, which will make it possible to take better account of young people's interests. The task was set of eliminating superfluous components in the administrative system and reducing the numerical strength of the Komsomol apparatus to an optimum balance.

A program to improve cadre work within the Komsomol organization was outlined. The plenum participants introduced many proposals aimed at a more persistent introduction of democratic mechanisms in the selection

and nomination to Komsomol posts of the most talented youth organizers capable of implementing the tasks of restructuring and skillfully working with the masses.

The plenum elected Komsomol delegates to the All-Union Congress of Workers in Public Education.

The plenum examined organizational questions.

The plenum released P. Ignotas from the duties of secretary and member of the bureau of the Komsomol Central Committee and from Central Committee membership in connection with his appointment to the post of deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers.

The plenum promoted A. Selyanov, secretary of the Moscow Engineering and Physics Institute, from candidate member to member of the Komsomol Central Committee.

The plenum removed V. Bolshakov, M. Dyagilev, V. Kolomytsyn, A. Manakov, and P. Nikitin from the Komsomol Central Committee in connection with changes in their place of work.

V. Zakharov, second secretary of the Kazakh Komsomol Central Committee; V. Karmanov, first secretary of the Chelyabinsk Kosmomol Obkom; N.Kuchinskiy, Komsomol Central Committee administrator; Yu. Skoropad, first secretary of the Kazakh Komsomol East Kazakhstan Obkom; and M. Shchukin, first secretary of the Khabarovsk Komsomol Kraykom, were made members of the Komsomol Central Committee by the plenum.

The plenum removed A. Gorevskiy and Ye. Epin from candidate membership of the Central Committee in connection with changes in their place of work.

G. Naleykina, senior pioneer leader at the Medvezhyegorskiy Rayon Povenets secondary school in the Karelian SSR; N. Novodvorskaya, student at Kustanay No. 12 Secondary School; S. Papin, second secretary of the Tajik Komsomol Central Committee, and K. Rybakov, first secretary of the Mari Komsomol Obkom; were made candidate members of the Komsomol Central Committee by the plenum.

The plenum adopted a decision on changes in the composition of standing and special commissions of the Komsomol Central Committee.

Polled Lessees Express Lack of Confidence

LD2111234688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] How do you feel, lessee? An answer to this question is contained in a survey conducted by the All-Union Public Opinion Study Center. If we sum up all the interviews of the people working in the new manner, it turns out that as yet the lessees are not confident about tomorrow. Half of them declared that they were meeting opposition from central directorates and financial administrations. The lessees see the reason for this in the administrators' unwillingness to give up power. Many apparatchiks say openly that losing power also means losing bonuses and other privileges. Thirty-three percent of the polled lessees explain the overt opposition by the fact that the administrators already see their uselessness to those who work under the new management conditions. And finally 17 percent of the respondents maintain that the opposition to the innovations is caused simply by inability to work under atypical conditions.

The head of the survey, Doctor of Economic Sciences (Valeriy Maksovich Rutgayzer), concludes that serious legal guarantees are needed to overcome the oppositon. It is necessary, he considers, to protect legally the lessee's economic independence so that everyone has the right to want his goods. An unequivocal law on leasing is needed.

We can add that such a document is already being prepared for a nationwide discussion and the research, the results of which we have presented to you, will help the legislators to prepare a properly functioning legal act.

'Forbidden Books' Return to Open Stocks

LD2111215788 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1327 GMT 21 Nov 88

[Text] Kishinev, 21 Nov (TASS)—TASS correspondent Elina Bolgarina writes:

Bending my head to avoid the doorway, I go down the steps and enter a small, dark room. Here, underground, are kept the special stocks of the State Library of Soviet Moldavia. Until recently, one could enter here only with a special permit. But the times are changing—in the era of restructuring in the USSR, "forbidden books" are being returned to the reader. The right corner of the room—two stacks reaching all the way to the ceiling—is already empty. Foreign language books, magazines, and bibliographies—2421 titles—and 168 Russian books have gone upstairs, to the general-use stocks and the reading rooms of the library.

What publications are they? The director of the library, Tatyana Levandovskaya, who leads the "book transfer" commission, explains:

During the first viewing, organized at the Foreign Literature Department, readers were glued to the multivolume encyclopedias of world literature by the German publisher Kindler. Such universal publications, books devoted to modern art, philosophy, psychology, and religion will help us to eliminate some of the "blank spots" in the study of world culture. Books by foreign economists, political scientists and sociologists are now widely accessible. The reasons that they were "locked up" are clear—many of them contained harsh appraisals of the activity of the Soviet state during the years of Stalin's and Brezhnev's government."

Centralized delivery of literature for special stocks has dropped sharply. "We have had no special post since February," says their head Vera Mura.

(Govett) Lifetime editions of the works of Bolsheviks of the Lenin Guard and memoirs of the October revolution have been returned to the reading room shelves. They, too, had been banned, along with the "White Memoirs" [Belyye Memuary] published in Moscow at the beginning of the 1920's, and solid works of those years on economics and national economic planning, which deviated from official doctrine in some way.

At the special storage fund, the monumental and painstaking work will soon begin of sorting and studying the literature and periodicals published in the Romanian language in Moldavia before the revolution and during the period of the occupation of Bessarabia in 1918-1940. This 4,000-strong fund contains quite a lot of interesting and important material in the field of local history and history and culture of the Moldavian people. Books by emigres of the 60's and 70's, including those who lived in Moldavia, will be brought out from oblivion.

New APN Chairman Vlasov Interviewed

PM1111163188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Oct 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with A.I. Vlasov, chairman of the APN Board, by S. Taranov under the rubric "Names and Events": "NOVOSTI in the Glasnost Epoch"—date and place of interview not given; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Albert Ivanovich Vlasov has been elected chairman of the APN Board.

Biographical information. A.I. Vlasov was born in 1930 in Moscow. He graduated from the Institute of Oriental Studies and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences. He worked at TASS as a correspondent, then as own correspondent in China and Burma. From 1971 through 1976 he was first deputy chairman of the APN Board. From 1976 through 1980 he was counselor at the Soviet embassy in Sweden. For the last 8 years he has been in the CPSU Central Committee apparatus as deputy chief of the International Information Department and first deputy chief of the Propaganda Department. He is a doctor of historical sciences.

[Taranov] First, Albert Ivanovich, a few words about APN. Many IZVESTIYA readers do not have a very clear idea about the character and scale of the agency's activity....

[Vlasov] Its task is to describe Soviet life abroad, although some APN material is also printed in "domestic" publications. The subjects of articles range from the most important political events and phenomena to facts which are simply interesting.

People may ask if we duplicate TASS' work. No. TASS provides information mainly on events which took place yesterday or today, and assesses them from the Soviet Government's viewpoint. NOVOSTI does not aim to be bang up to the minute. The agency's articles provide greater detail and a variety of viewpoints—those of writers, scientists, and leaders of enterprises and departments, and simply Soviet people, whose opinions interest readers from other countries.

APN articles are disseminated in more than 100 states. Twenty-seven journals with a total print run of 2.5 million copies, 170 information bulletins, and thousands of book titles in 50 languages are published....

[Taranov] APN is a public organization. What is the reason for the agency's status?

[Vlasov] Our founders are creative unions, the Academy of Sciences, cultural organization, and book publishers.... Such a wide range of "shareholders" makes it possible to reflect the whole range of opinions, judgments, and assessments which exist in society. There is probably no need to explain what prospects this opens up in conditions of glasnost and democratization.

[Taranov] You also worked with APN in the mid-seventies. What has changed since then?

[Vlasov] There are more debate articles about specific questions. They debate and discuss any questions both with opponents within the country, and with Western journalists, public figures, and politicians. An important point is that this is not futile competition in a quest for the usual mutual recriminations, nor clarification of "who is better" and "who is worse," but a dialogue between partners who are trying to understand each other. I would say that APN is mastering a new role, trying in every possible way to establish contacts between peoples and wash away the dam of prejudice and distrust. This is a complicated and contradictory process, but there is no alternative to it. But the new political thinking gives rise to new forms of exchange of information. I am not talking about the increased technical potential—for example, the production and dissemination of videocassettes about Soviet life.

[Taranov] But it is very difficult to get even the most honest material into the pages of reputable Western newspapers and journals. There is just as much competition in the information sphere as in the consumer goods market....

[Vlasov] You know, one of the reproaches leveled at APN was that we were published in secondary publications disseminated over a limited geographical area and in a limited print run. And our own journals and bulletins reach the mass reader with difficulty. So we need to prepare really interesting and bold publications and recruit new authors who have something to say to the world.

Another path is the preparation of joint articles, books, video films, and photographic exhibitions.... APN also acts as a intermediary in obtaining information for foreign correspondents accredited to the USSR. Briefings and press conferences to which we invite well known scientists and ministry and department leaders have become regular events....

[Taranov] What demands, in your view, does glasnost make on journalists?

[Vlasov] They should abandon dogma and antiquated stereotypes more rapidly. Glasnost also means responsibility. And in order to be responsible you must know what you are writing about, thoroughly, in every nuance and detail. The time of journalistic jacks-of-all-trades is past. Experts and specialists are needed...but often in our country one person comments with unusual ease on events in China, Africa, and the United States—and on questions of disarmament and humanitarian problems. Hence the superficiality, cliches, and, as a result, half-truths. How, for example, can such a "jack-of-all-trades" conduct a discussion? Willy-nilly, he ends up having to use not facts, but "naked" ideology.... Generally, we must learn, and relearn.

[Taranov] Some feel that glasnost exists in two forms in our country: for "export" and for "internal consumption." Is that so?

[Vlasov] Not now. The frankness with which we discuss social problems at home is equally typical of articles meant for the foreign reader. There are no limitations on glasnost here which come "from above." Catering to the awareness and knowledge of someone in another country who wants to know about the main and most important events taking place in the USSR is another matter. So, naturally, topics for abroad are specially selected.

[Taranov] The first session of the APN Board in which you participated has just ended. What are your impressions?

[Vlasov] We discussed the main concern—the quality of work, which depends both on the organization of labor and on a fair system of incentives and remuneration, on people's desire to develop and improve.... I liked the interest and concern. I saw people who were genuinely enthusiastic about their work; moreover many APN employees are young, and have come here in recent years.

Academy of Sciences Vice President Interviewed

PM1111093988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with V.N. Kudryavtsev, newly elected vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by Ye. Manucharova under the rubric "Names and Events": "Following the Logic of Humanism"—date and place unspecified; first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] The USSR Academy of Sciences General Meeting held recently elected five new vice presidents. IZVESTIYA has already published conversations with four of them: Academicians Yu.A. Osipyan, N.P. Laverov, O.M. Nefedov, and R.V. Petrov. Today we interview Academician Vladimir Nikolayevich Kudryavtsev, newly elected vice president in charge of social sciences.

Born in 1923, he is the author of more than 200 scientific works on the theory and sociology of law. He is director of the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute. He is actively involved in the drafting of new Soviet legislation. He is vice president of the Association of Soviet Lawyers, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, and the International Society for Social Defense. He is also a USSR State Prize winner.

[Manucharova] Vladimir Nikolayevich! I would like to hear your opinion as vice president of the academy: What do you see as the main task in the restructuring of the social sciences?

[Kudryavtsev] Overcoming scholasticism and dogmatism and making the social sciences face reality. The social sciences must become the theoretical basis for making sensible, farsighted political and state decisions.

[Manucharova] Which specific problems require primary attention?

[Kudryavtsev] A very great many: the problem of ownership under socialism, mechanisms for guaranteeing and protecting citizens' rights, "blank spots" in history, forms of people's social activeness, and national relations. Studies on various aspects of the formation of the rule-of-law state and improvement of the work of legal institutions are extremely necessary in connection with the reform of the political system.

[Manucharova] Does this not mean that the work of social scientists will be mainly applied work?

[Kudryavtsev] No applied work will be of any benefit without the elucidation of fundamental principles. We need to create a theoretical concept of contemporary socialism and ways to renew it in the economic, social, political, and spiritual spheres.

A far-reaching process of making relations among people more democratic and more humane lies ahead, which means that a number of fundamental issues will have to be solved. For example: the correlation between general human, class, national, and group values and interests and the dialectics of world development in the light of the unity of mankind and the heterogeneous, contradictory nature of the modern world. And, in the sphere of political and legal science, the problems of power and management, democracy and freedom, persuasion and coercion, and so forth. The question of elucidating the history of previous eras also requires fundamental analysis.

In my opinion, all kinds of work should be encouraged in the social sciences: fundamental and applied research and journalism. Without serious groundwork for the future, science will, at best, turn into a trade or—if it has no practical application—into scholasticism. Public information is now one of the main instruments in the restructuring of public awareness.

[Manucharova] New methods of researching social processes will evidently be required.

[Kudryavtsev] Without a doubt. The social sciences are now arming themselves with statistics, using social experiments, analyzing public opinion, and studying the experience of other countries. Multiple-option forecasts have also begun to be used.

For this we need free scientific research, pluralism of opinions, the democratization of the atmosphere of scientific work itself.

[Manucharova] This is the first time a lawyer has been elected vice president of the Academy of Sciences. Is this not a requirement of the times? How do you yourself explain this choice?

[Kudryavtsev] It is not for me to judge—it is up to the members of the academy. But I see it as a sign of increased attention and respect to legal issues, which is natural in the light of the public expectations associated with the creation of a rule-of-law state, the development of democracy, strengthening of the rule of law, and protection of citizens' rights and freedoms.

[Manucharova] Despite all the differences in social structure in different states, is it possible to talk of a united front of social sciences?

[Kudryavtsev] Front is a military word. It is time we changed our vocabulary. But it is not a question of words, of course; what is important is that the efforts of scientists in different countries and the entire world community can and must be combined in this peaceful, noble field of science.

After all, global problems are not confined to technology or the natural sciences—environmental protection, for example, is also a social task. The problems of population, education, the fight against drug addiction, crime, and other negative phenomena, and the solution of regional conflicts—these are all social science subjects which we have long been studying in close cooperation with philosophers, economists, legal experts, and sociologists in a number of countries in both East and West. And this benefits the interests of mankind.

[Manucharova] I know that many of your books have been translated into foreign languages—your monograph "Causality in Criminology," for example. It was first published 20 years ago and is considered a classic. But which of your own books do you like most of all?

[Kudryavtsev] Possibly "Social Deviations." (It came out 4 years ago). It covers the whole gamut of negative phenomena. This collective monograph will soon be coming out in a second, fuller edition.

[Manucharova] What is most important in a lawyer's thinking?

[Kudryávtsev] Logic is probably the most important thing in his thinking, and justice and humanism in his actions.

[Manucharova] There is a Roman saying imprinted on our memories: "May justice triumph even if the world perish." Do you agree with this formula?

[Kudryavtsev] It seems too categorical and brutal to me. You should not impose your own aims and views at any price, even if they are just. And, in general, the thesis "the end justifies the means" should be unequivocally condemned: We are only too well aware of what this has led to in practice. So, if we are talking about justice, the idea expressed by F.M. Dostoyevskiy is far more profound and humane: No abstract ideas or principles imposed on people are worth the tears of a single child...

A society cannot be perfect if anyone is suffering. I see the main duty of social scientists as being to work in the name of and for the good of man.

Economic

Draft Issued on Estonian Special Economic Zone

WA18200084 Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian 15 Oct 88 p 1

[Draft Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which can be adopted on the basis of the proposal of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet: "On the Introduction of a Special Economic Zone in the Estonian SSR"]

[Text] The idea of creating special economic zones is not new. They exist in many regions of the world. The experience of China, for example, is evidence that in a comparatively short time it is possible to achieve striking changes in the economy.

We have debated this subject more than once. A special economic zone is being created in the Far East, and preparatory measures are being undertaken in Leningrad, Odessa, Lithuania, and Estonia.

The draft published below provides an idea of the hows and whys.

1. Starting with the day of publishing the current Ukase the Estonian SSR is proclaimed a special economic zone of the USSR with the goal of attracting foreign capital

under privileged conditions for the technical and technological reconstruction and modernization of the Estonian SSR national economy, for the favorable export and import of goods for the Estonian SSR, and for increasing currency receipts.

2. To achieve the goals set for the special economic zone and to implement an open and flexible economic policy, sovereignty is granted to the Estonian SSR and its state organs.

3. The organs of state power of the Estonian SSR and the government of the USSR guarantee the economic and legal conditions for the activity of foreign capital in the special economic zone (enterprises created by attracting foreign capital and joint enterprises in production, transport, trade, etc.).

The rights of foreign investors are guaranteed in accordance with local laws. Investors' property cannot be nationalized or expropriated. In extraordinary cases (violation of laws) this can be done only with the appropriate complete compensation.

4. Capital investment in science-intensive high-technology production is preferred, accompanied by reconstruction and change in the profile of existing enterprises, as well as the creation of the necessary infrastructure. Additional import of workers is not permitted, with the exception of foreign specialists and experts which the overseas firms consider necessary.

5. The rights to use land and other natural resources for foreign capital are determined by lease contract, concluded by the organs of state power of the Estonian SSR and with the introduction of the corresponding taxes.

6. With the agreement of the State Banks of the USSR and the Estonian SSR, foreign investors have the right to create in the special economic zone branches of foreign banks, joint banks, or other financial institutions.

7. The Estonian SSR government establishes the volume of imported foreign capital and the areas of its use, and makes decisions on issuing the appropriate permission.

8. Taxes amounting to 15 percent of income are collected in the local budget from all operations of foreign capital (entrepreneurial and other).

Foreign investments used for reprofiling and technical-technological reconstruction of existing enterprises, introduction of high-technology, creation of scientific-technical centers (technopolises), renovation of agricultural technology, and the development of biotechnology in agriculture are exempt from taxes for the first 5 years.

In other areas foreign investments are exempt from taxes for the first 2 years, and in the subsequent 3 years the taxes are cut by 50 percent.

The Estonian SSR government has the right to grant tax priviliges to foreign capital invested in other spheres vitally important to the republic, or in sectors in which more than half of the production goes for export.

9. With the permission of the Estonian SSR government, all enterprises in which the relative share of foreign capital comprises not less than 25 percent have the right to engage directly in export-import transactions, exempt from tariff taxes, for importing machines, equipment, raw materials, and means of communication and transportation needed for the enterprise.

10. Prices for goods sold in other regions of the USSR are determined by the enterprises according to contracts. Trade agreements are subject to an income tax, the size of which is determined by the Estonian SSR government and which goes into the Estonian SSR budget.

11. Foreign investors have the right, without hindrance, to transfer abroad non-taxed profits in foreign currency or to exchange it for local currency (krona) or rubles. With reinvestments the government has the right to cut taxes on profits. The currency exchange rate is determined by the USSR State Bank and the Estonian SSR State Bank.

12. All foreign citizens whose countries have diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and who intend to come to the special economic zone of Estonia for resolving questions of economic or technical cooperation, or to visit relatives and friends for a period of not more than 15 days can resolve all formalities connected with visas in Tallinn, including extension of visas or trips to other union republics of the USSR.

State organs of the Estonian SSR can grant foreign investors and their families multiple-time visas.

The special economic zone has its own foreign representation in states connected with it through intensive capital investments and foreign economic relations. The Estonian SSR Council of Ministers, in coordination with the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, resolves the question of creating such representation.

13. Travel of citizens between the special economic zone and other regions of the USSR is regulated by Estonian SSR law, guaranteeing free travel of all people having Estonian citizenship. The USSR currency ruble is valid in the special economic zone along with the zone's special currency krona. The Estonian SSR State Bank, in coordination with the USSR State Bank, determines the exchange rate and limits.

Moscow TV Reports on Far East Economic Zones

OW2111021588 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1005 GMT on 12 November carries its scheduled "Restructuring Spotlight" program, presented by political observer Vladimir Tsvetov. The

program begins with shots of the coast and then cuts to show Tsvetov interviewing people in the streets of a city. Tsvetov asks several individuals whether or not they have heard that Nakhodka "will be included in a joint enterprise zone." Most have not. As video shows port facilities in Nakhodka, Tsvetov says: "The maritime gates of the USSR. Judging by the flags on foreign vessels secured at Nakhodka and in Vostochnyy Port, and by the volume of goods' turnover here, this is certainly true.

"In 1987, the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution entitled: On the Establishment and Activities on USSR Territory of Joint Enterprises with the Participation of Soviet Organizations and Companies from Capitalist and Developing Countries. The idea arose to turn our Far Eastern gateway to the sea into a joint enterprise zone. Is this approach right for this location? I posed this question to the leaders of Nakhodka and Vostochnyy."

Video cuts to show Tsvetov in an office interviewing Yuriy Nikolayevich Merinov, identified by a screen caption as Gorkom first secretary. Tsvetov says: "Yuriy Nikolayevich, if we look at how this is done in the world, then the establishment of joint enterprise zones requires the prior solution of a number of issues: 1) the creation of a surplus work force here; 2) the existence of a diverse infrastructure; and 3) the existence of a fairly broad social service sector. Are all these conditions available in Nakhodka to establish this kind of zone?"

Merinov responds: "Yes, we have been looking at these questions closely and, if we speak frankly, Nakhodka does not have either the first, second, or third conditions today. So presently the resolution adopted on the establishment of a free economic zone on the territory of Maritime Kray, which includes Nakhodka City, gives rise to a number of very serious problems concerning the practical implementation of these questions."

Video intercuts abruptly to Tsvetov interviewing G.P. Zhebelev, identified by screen caption as chief of Vostochnyy Port. Zhebelev says: "In my view, a particularly enormous problem is that of social service amenities, the creation of acceptable conditions for our workers here—those who live in Maritime Kray—because our labor turnover is simply crazy. In the past 10 years, only 7 percent of the specialists have remained in the Nakhodka area; 93 percent have left. The reason is that the waiting list for housing is 15 to 17 years, and the level of social welfare is at a minimum. They are even afraid that their children will receive a worse general education than in any city in the European part of the USSR."

Video again intercuts abruptly to Tsvetov talking to V.M. Lifshits, identified by screen caption as a doctor of geographic sciences. Lifshits says: "The Nakhodka area represents an extremely favorable place for establishing any kind of zone, particularly a joint enterprise zone. Nakhodka is that one place in the Soviet Union which is similar to such places in Southeast Asia as Singapore or, say, the Kra Peninsula in Malaysia. More than half the population of Maritime Kray live between Vladivostok and Nakhodka. Correspondingly, the main condition for the economic zone would be satisfied: that is, rotation of the work force through the free enterprise zone, and the ensuing dissemination of experience to every corner of the Soviet Union, beginning with Maritime Kray.

"This location is very handy, and not only for the transshipment of freight, as basically is being done now in the Nakhodka area. Joint enterprises should be set up in this purely-port or purely-railroad zone, ensuring the requirements of the people of both the Soviet Union and the countries of the Asian-Pacific Region."

Video cuts to Tsvetov speaking to V.K. Lozovoy, identified by screen caption as general director of the Association for Business Cooperation with Asian-Pacific Region Countries. Lozovoy says: "Free enterprise zone, joint cooperation—these are very popular terms today, raising questions with everybody who attaches any hopes to them, although currently we have no experience. Other than what has been done by our neighbors, we have practically no other information. In practice, it seems to me that we do not have any studies or estimates with which we could size things up seriously. Scientists are working on this and the practical workers have some ideas. Everyone already sees some kind of activity for themselves in this area, so to speak. But, so far, there is nothing comprehensive."

Video shows more scenes of ocean port facilities as Tsvetov notes that opinions have been voiced for and against the establishment of the zone. He then says: "However, something needs to be done for the development of the Kray's productive forces." Video again shows Tsvetov interviewing Nakhodka Gorkom first secretary Merinov, who says: "Today, we can attract neither an additional work force nor engage in the output of finished products, because we have these problems. Hence, other ways must be found."

As video shows packets of logs being loaded into a bulk carrier, Tsvetov asks: "What other ways are there? Party and economic leaders of the Nakhodka-Vostochnyy Port region have an answer." Video shows Tsvetov talking to Vostochnyy Port Chief Zhebelev, who says: "Complex use of the timber resources of our Maritime and Khabarovsk krays could provide an opportunity for exporting dressed lumber rather than round timber for boards and beams, for the utilization of waste, for the production of wood fiber and wood chip tiles as well as parquet planks and other lumber products, and maybe even for the production of furniture, which would give the country an opportunity to increase the inflow of foreign currency three, four, or five times."

Tsvetov is then shown interviewing O.V. Maslekha, identified by screen caption as chief of the Daltekhflot [Far Eastern Technical Fleet], who says: "We figure that if we were to conclude a contract with a Japanese

company we could work there and carry out dredging work in ports, or do some other hydraulic engineering work there, and then possibly, with the foreign currency we earn, we could carry out maintenance of our ships."

Video again shows Merinov talking to Tsvetov. Merinov says: "Nakhodka City is one of the major fish catching and processing centers, not in the Maritime Kray alone, but in the Far East as well. It is very hard for us today to realize that we are still turning out fresh frozen fish and semi-processed products as the main fish products. It seems that today we should employ new technologies and build new capacities to turn out completed products." Video shows more coastline as Tsvetov notes that these are opinions pointing to areas of possible joint enterprises and ways to develop this region. He then asks whether this opportunity is realistic.

Video again shows V.K. Lozovoy, who says: "The ordinary goods exchange to which we have become accustomed will not give us this opportunity. It is true that availability of manpower is a problem in the Far East. We must begin with the infrastructure. But we would not want these obviously expressed negative points to promptly determine the outcome. After all, we should try, and it seems to me that, despite these negative points, a rational kernel exists."

Tsvetov is then shown again talking to Lifshits. Lifshits says: "I can only talk about two ship repair plants visited by Japanese delegations. Talks are being held at both of these plants on the establishment of joint enterprises. Before the delegations visited these plants talks were proceeding very slowly. After the visits, the Japanese side, or rather both sides, expressed a desire to accelerate these talks, and every effort is already being made to deliver foreign vessels to these plants for repair work."

Video abruptly cuts again to show Tsvetov interviewing Maslekha, who says: "Mainly fish industry enterprises are already engaged specifically in this issue, and apparently by the end of this year or the beginning of next, some joint enterprises will already have been set up, because there is interest in this, both on our side and particularly on the Japanese side."

Video cuts to show Zhebelev, who says: "The potash salt and urea complex could be a joint enterprise project with Japanese companies, particularly Sumitomo Corporation, which has a great desire to take part in this project, as well as the Solomon Company of the United States which is also interested in importing our potash salt from the USSR."

Video again shows Nakhodka Gorkom First Secretary Merinov, who says: "Of course, in its classical understanding it is unacceptable to talk about a free economic zone. Therefore, today we have set up a scientific practical group directly under the gorispolkom, which is engaged in elaborating these issues in order to see how, in the current conditions taking shape in our city, an attempt can be made to solve the problems posed by this resolution."

Video cuts to Tsvetov in the studio with the "Restructuring Spotlight" program logo behind him. He says: "As you can see, there is no simple answer. Maybe this is not all bad. After all, just 3 years ago, after a pronouncement from a high rostrum, all those with whom I spoke would have raised their arms and energetically reported: It will be carried out. Now, people are analyzing the proposed idea. Those who have doubts express them and substantiate their positions. Enthusiasts of the idea also do not accept it at face value. They strengthen their enthusiasm with solid arguments. As a result, I am sure that the best solution for implementing this idea will be found. There is another result of glasnost: the idea is acquiring sincere supporters.

"When I was taking the interviews in Nakhodka, which you have just heard, I constantly thought about my meetings in the streets with ordinary residents of the city. You heard their responses at the beginning of my report." Video cuts abruptly to show Tsvetov interviewing A.L. Kotikov, identified by screen caption as deputy chairman of the Nakhodka Gorispolkom. Tsvetov asks: "You have already discussed with your voters the issue of establishing a joint enterprise here, or this will come as a surprise to them?" Kotikov replies: "It will come as a surprise to them. Literally yesterday, I met my electorate, the voters whose interests I represent in the city soviet, and there I reported on this for the first time. Well...." Tsvetov interrupts and asks: "What was the reaction? Was it incredulity?" Kotikov continues: "The first reaction of course was smiles and distrust, as if to say: Is this another fairy tale from one of the leaders?"

Tsvetov then asks: "Tell me please, are you confident that your electorate will support you on this issue?" Kotikov replies: "In this issue, I am confident that I shall get their support, because the prospects are more defined than ever before." The program ends with video shots of a "Raketa" hydrofoil crossing open sea.

Odessa Oblast Wants Free Economic Zone Created

PM2111152588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Following Publication in IZVESTIYA": "'Free Economic Zones' (Issue No 227)"]

[Text] It was under this headline that we published a transcript of an interview by one of our correspondents with a group of specialists from the Economics of the World Socialist System Institute on the prospects for creating free economic zones in the USSR. The item mentioned Odessa Oblast in particular as having significant potential for the creation of such a zone in its territory.

Writing to the editorial office, B.P. Melnik, deputy chairman of the Odessa Oblispolkom, reports that the ispolkom, taking into account the fact that operations by a free economic zone in Odessa Oblast would have a positive effect on the region's economy, examined at one of its sessions a suggestion by the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Southern Scientific Center on this question, and has applied to the USSR Council of Ministers and the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers for permission to create such a zone in the oblast. Bearing in mind the importance and complexity of the problem, B.P. Melnik writes, we deem it expedient to continue its examination in the newspaper's pages.

Inadequate Refrigeration Culprit in Meat Spoilage
WA18240023 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Nov 88 p 1

[Article by Yu. Grinko: "Warmed Up By Cold"]

[Text] Information reported to me recently is so disconcerting that even a vegetarian would react...and God knows what the reaction of all other eaters who read this newspaper would be.

It turns out that every year the refrigeration enterprises of the USSR Gosagroprom waste no more and no less than...200,000 tons of meat products. Meat!

How? Why?

Here is how. However regrettable, meat has the bad property of spoiling if stored in a warm place.

"What do you mean in a warm place?" I can anticipate letters of indignation. "Why do we have refrigerators?"

Naturally, refrigerators are in very short supply and most of those which are available have reached the end of the line, or else their systems date from the times of Ochakov and the conquest of the Crimea. Naturally, what kind of cold could they provide?

Everything is quite simple....

"Therefore, we must rebuild the old and build new refrigeration factories!" the most perspicacious readers would say.

Naturally, this is correct. However, it is wrong.... For the reason that what is needed above all is modern equipment and technology.

"It seems that science has fallen somewhat behind," would be the general guess.

That is not the point.

A major decision was made 8 years ago. According to it, the All-Union Scientific Research and Design-Technological Refrigeration Industry Institute (today the Agrokholodprom NPO) was instructed to head the implementation of a unified technological policy and to coordinate scientific research for the development and use of industrial refrigeration. In addition to the institute in Moscow, institute branches were set up in Kharkov, a department in Krasnodar, testing and experimental plants, and two enterprises for the production of fast frozen goods. A total of 1,340 people, including 162 scientific associates, among whom one doctor and 45 candidates of science, were recruited for the study, design and manufacturing of prototypes.

As we may see, an effort was made to see to it that the domestic refrigeration industry find itself, if not in a leading place on the planet, at least not in the position of a hopeless rear guard. What use was made of the refrigeration work of those masters?

To say that no use was made would be a great distortion of the truth. A very great use was made in the sense that many people were able suitably to warm their hands on refrigeration. Everyone benefited: Some 18 million rubles were spent at that time.

There were results.

The most efficient work in this area was done at the North Caucasian Department (SKO) of the head institute. This was to be expected, considering the zeal with which the peculiarly understood principle that "the cadres decide everything" was interpreted here.

Talk about the specialists who were recruited! Starting with the fact that the former director Yu. Novikov and his replacement, V. Burakov, turned out to be, even taking a most charitable view, total ignoramuses.

The team they recruited was well matched. For example, A. Golubev, having previously dealt with matters of tobacco and makhorka, became head of the refrigeration equipment department. Comrade Datsko, previously the luckless director of the ZhBI plant, became a leading specialist in the designing of refrigeration compartments. The application department was headed by V. Artemenko, previously chief engineer at the Krasnodar meat combine, which became notorious throughout the country by its scale of pilfering.

The most colorful figure in the collective was Engineer V. Stoyaba. When outsiders wonderingly asked the SKO leadership what made this comrade undertake a project outside his line of work, the command raised eyebrows with a sense of outrage: "He is the former chief of prisons in the entire kray! In both cases it is a question of cells...."

A shift from science to jails, well, anything may happen. But switching from running a prison to science...one should be born with a "Newtonian sharpness of mind!"

The clearer the professional unsuitability was manifested in scientific and production activities, the more it was encouraged individually. Additions to salaries poured out as though from a horn of plenty. Tens of thousands of rubles were additionally poured into the development of totally worthless projects. Accounts cracked at the seams from the amounts deposited for wages. Illegal bonuses and wages for time not worked became the standard.

For the sake of fairness let us note that there were conscientious workers in the SKO, who became indignant at such practices. But just try to correct the situation.... The ship's mutiny was suppressed mercilessly. The grand masters of simplified forms and rituals of bookkeeping gathered at the "helm." In addition to Yu. Novikov and V. Burakov, they included party organization secretary S. Polovinko and trade-union committee chairman Yu. Naumenko. They did not waste too much time in instilling in the minds of their subordinates the important concept that babblers are born but people who keep their mouths shut are made....

As passions swirled, many people began to consider the development of new refrigeration systems a matter of sixth-rate importance, although the kray's agro-industrial combines were experiencing an extremely urgent need for modern refrigeration equipment, looking for it abroad, not relying on the SKO. For the past 6 years, for example, the SKO has been doing magic incantations on the subject of the FAM-500 refrigeration machine. Two hundred thousand rubles were spent on its development, although initially the request was for no more than 85,000. Based on the initial technical concept, this monster is unwilling to work even after V. Chernyak and Ye. Agarev, deputy directors of the head institute, went to see the people in charge during the various stages in the development of this unit.

For the past 2 years scientists have been dealing with the FAM at the Khladoprodukt plant in Moscow. Ever-newer parts are being brought to the capital from the Kuban, regardless of cost, but the completion is not in sight. It is indeed quite easy to shame the fatherland but, conversely, it is so difficult to bring it honor, that despite the tremendous efforts invested by so many people there has been no success. Actually, why do we keep speaking of Krasnodar? Could it be that the climate there is different? Could it be that its soil is unsuitable for raising intelligent and conscientious refrigeration scientists? What is the situation at the Agrokholodprom head institute?

You know, it is no better....

The specialists in Moscow as well cannot be blamed for remaining indifferent to this attractive process, which is crowned by writing on a document "to be paid in full." They, too, have become good at setting up substantial bonus funds based on the cost of "paper" work (drafting instructions, and so on), and skillfully allocating them. Last year, for example, bonuses totaled 56,000 rubles and not a single laboratory where people zealously frittered their time remained without a bonus. Although initially the administrative-managerial personnel may have been burning with the desire to be crystal pure in their honesty, something may have prevented it. As a result, 17,000 rubles quietly went into various pockets, which is double the stipulated rate.

Conversely, those who were directly responsible for the development of functional equipment were paid, quite accidentally one might think, 10,000 rubles.... And after that, just try to demand of them any kind of scientific zeal and total dedication of their creative potential, and everything else which is so greatly necessary.

The materials of the investigation of the activities of the Agrokholodprom NPO, conducted by the USSR People's Control Committee, draw a picture of mass parasitism. The plans of the structural subdivisions contain stupefyingly petty topics. As a rule, the most significant projects take years to complete and end, with incomprehensible recommendations or conclusions not binding to anyone. Just think: Of more than 300 studies conducted between 1981 and 1985, 75 percent (!) proved to be inefficient.

No single even somewhat noteworthy work on reducing natural losses in the storing of produce and processing it in refrigeration facilities and in transportation can be credited to the NPO during that period. The revision of shrinkage rates was reduced here essentially to processing the accountability data of enterprises concerning actual losses. Rates are based essentially on such data.

Yet one did not have to be too knowledgeable to determine that the country's meat combines have a great many means for refrigerating and freezing products. All of them have their rates for natural losses, which sometimes vary, for the same item, by as much as a factor of 10. What a vast field that offers for abuse, distortion of accountability and irresponsibility!

It would be naive to demand of subordinates high labor returns if the manager himself provides a classical example of irresponsibility. The head institute spent 7 years in developing refrigeration facilities using progressive meat processing and storage technology. For 5 years a collective of 16 people, including seven candidates of science, headed by the already mentioned Ye. Agarev, deputy director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute in charge of scientific affairs, spent 800,000 rubles with zero results—but nonetheless was able to report the full completion of the project. Covering its tracks with the presentation by Ye. Agarev, for this 5-year plan the NPO

planned the development of individual technological processes and systems for refrigeration facilities worth in excess of 1 million rubles. Two years passed. Half of the allocated funds were spent and there have been no actual results.

Deadlines are being extended for the execution of each fifth of the completed topics, after their completion has been reported. The correcting of planned projects has become a customary occupation. One-quarter of the assignments has been "deleted" in general from the approved programs, which made it possible to conceal the cost of worthless work.

Could it be that there is no control over the "refrigeration workers?" Is there no one to take them to task?

Naturally, there are such people. The Agrokholodprom NPO is managed by the Myasomolprom Scientific and Technical Center (headed by A. Kamnik) and the department for the production and processing of animal husbandry products of the USSR Gosagroprom (deputy chief V. Demin). They are well informed of the "successes" of the NPO in terms of its scientific and financial-economic activities.

They may know it but are in no hurry to exercise their power. Are A. Kamnik and V. Demin out and out liberals (incidentally, at our expense....)? Is it that they are so tired of looking at their own state of affairs that "refrigeration" affairs are to them nothing but a petty concern....

This is a "petty" matter which directly involves annual losses of a product in very short supply, expressed in the astronomical figure of 200 million kilograms....

Agricultural

Murakhovskiy Speaks at Agro-Industrial Ceremony

LD1911185288 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The day of workers in agriculture and processing industries of the agro-industrial complex will be celebrated Sunday [20 November]. A ceremonial meeting devoted to this holiday was held today in Moscow. In the presidium were Comrades Ligachev, Nikonov, and Baklanov; USSR and RSFSR ministers; the winners of socialist competition; and production innovators and scientists. A report was delivered by Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee.

He talked about the need to further improve the economic mechanism in the agro-industrial complex. Further progress will require deep qualitative changes in production relations and the accelerated development of scientific and technical progress. [video shows Murakhovskiy making speech, with Ligachev, Baklanov and Nikonov among those on platform]

Murakhovskiy Interviewed on Agriculture Production

LD2111115688 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1540 GMT 18 Nov 88

[Interview with Vsevolod Serafimovich Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Agro-Industrial Committee, by unidentified station correspondent "on the eve of the day of the workers in agriculture and the processing industry of the agro-industrial complex"—date and place not given; recorded]

[Text] [Murakhovskiy] Allow me to take this opportunity first and foremost to greet all workers in the agro-industrial complex on the day of the worker in agriculture and the processing industry.

[Correspondent] Vsevolod Serafimovich, restructuring is taking place in the country's agro-industrial complex, too. What has proved possible to be done, and what still remains?

[Murakhovskiy] If I am to describe restructuring in the countryside, then I ought to note that the further improvement of production relationships in the countryside is the most characteristic feature at the present. Leasing forms of production organization are being widely introduced on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and in industrial enterprises belonging to the processing industry. Collective, family and individual contracting are being introduced upon leasing principles. Everywhere farms and enterprises are going over to financial autonomy, self-recouping, and self-financing. Further improvement of management is taking place at all levels of production. All this is creating a new atmosphere for the development of production: it creates conditions for initiative on the part of workers and gives them a material interest in the end results of their work.

As is known, the party Central Committee and the government recently adopted a major program for road construction in the Non-Chernozem Zone. A large program has been mapped out, covering the period up to the year 1995. Over this period the intention is that this major region will be covered by a network of good roads with a hard surface. This will, of course, be of great importance and will introduce considerable changes into the living conditions of the people living in these oblasts and rayons.

In addition it is intended to carry out a major program for bringing gas supplies to the villages of this region. This, too, will create new conditions for living, for improving everyday life, for raising the overall living standards of people in that zone. And we hope that by changing living conditions, this program—both these programs—will not just create conditions for persuading

people to stay in the villages of this zone, but will attract many new people, too, who will come to this region with its rich opportunities to increase agriculture production, to produce primarily meat and milk, here, I want to stress once again, in this favorable zone.

It has to be noted that the years of the current 5-year-plan period have been years of active work in implementing the food program. We understand that, of course, we have not been able to transform the situation in full measure with regard to food supplies to the population. The workers of the agro-industrial complex understand their responsibility for this and are taking all steps to increase agricultural production, especially meat, milk, vegetables, and fruit, during the remaining years of the current 5-year-plan period. In 1989-90 we are faced with approximately doubling the growth rate of production of these products in comparison with the period that has elapsed.

[Correspondent] Vsevolod Serafimovich, it seems to me that the most important problem which has to be solved in order to secure supplies of food products for the country is that of a stable grain production and processing industry. Unfortunately the advances are not as great as one would want.

[Murakhovskiy] You are right to say that we have to solve the issues of grain production in order to solve the issues of improving food supplies. Many people have no doubt seen on television and heard on the radio or read in the newspapers of the conferences that have taken place recently at the party Central Committee, where there was discussion of the priority development of the agro-industrial complex.

[Correspondent] Yes, and these questions were also raised at the conference which has just ended in Orel Oblast.

[Murakhovskiy] Speaking at these conferences, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the party Central Committee, stressed once again that increasing grain prodcution and building up the production of meat and milk remain the key tasks for us. We see for ourselves the ways of achieving these objectives, and the main thing for us today is to widely introduce collective, family and individual contracting, to give people an interest in high end results, to ensure the introduction of scientific and technical progress in agricultural production—in grain production this means introducing intensive technologies for grain production—and on the basis of this to achieve a sharp increase in gross yields. To be able to live comfortably—let's put it like that—we have to have 240-250 million tonnes of grain. We are capable of doing that, if only all those people who are engaged in grain production today know what they are doing and observe strictly the technology for growing grain using the intensive technologies. We are now being given sufficient quantities of mineral fertilizers for these areas; we are being given plant protection resources; and if these are used intelligently and with a knowledge of what we are doing then we will be able to ensure increased grain production. This is our main path.

We have to substantially increase production of feed grain. Here the main direction lies in increasing the production of corn on irrigated areas. Experience shows that on many farms in the Ukraine, the northern Caucasus, the Volga region, and other regions of our country, in Central Asia and in Kazakhstan, in places where there is an attentive attitude toward this crop, very good results are obtained. I would like to say that even in oblasts like Kurgan, they have obtained this year approximately 70 quintals of corn per hectare. That is, on those farms that have now joined together in the corn production system. Based on programs created by the zonal institute under the leadership of Comrade (Sikorskiy) our scientists are introducing this progressive technology for growing grain for cattle feed in this zone, and they have obtained those kinds of results this year. Experience of the work of the Zarya Kommunizma Kolkhoz in Rovno Oblast shows that in those regions of the Ukraine it is possible to obtain 8-10 tonnes of grain, of dry corn per hactare; that is the Polesye region. The work experience of Orlovskiy Kolkhoz in Kirovskiy Rayon of Stavropol Kray shows that 8-10 tonnes of dry corn per hectare can also be obtained with irrigation in that zone. In a word, many such examples could have been given. This year on Engels Kolkhoz in Saratov Oblast they also obtained 7 tonnes of grain per hectare using irrigation. Today, therefore, the question is whether our people, using the winter period, can master the technology for growing corn on irrigated land. That is one side. The other side of this matter requires us to considerably improve the production of corn seed stock. This task faces the seed selection centers of the V.I. Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences institutes and the agro-industrial complex. In the next few years we have to solve questions of the production of good corn hybrids capable of producing high grain yields in the different zones of our country. Feed grain is turned into meat, into milk, and this is what the Soviet people expect from us.

[Correspondent] The process in industry: there are still very large losses, and there have been omissions in the way production has been organized.

[Murakhovskiy] Yes, and these have led to the lagging behind of the processing industry in the agro-industrial complex. Today it is a question of improving the situation quickly. A major program for reequipping and developing the processing industry has been mapped out in our country. It has to be said that this program is being fulfilled by, or rather that the civilian machine-building ministries and the ministries of the defense complex have been brought into fulfilling this program, by a decision of the party Central Committee and the government, and they have all now actively joined in this work. The chief ministries have been determined. They have to organize the development and serial production of equipment for dairies, meat processing enterprises, and

food enterprises. By the value of the equipment alone this program is assessed at approximately R40 billion. Never before have we made such a large quantity of equipment at our works. If one is to take the overall program with the capital expenditure on erecting new enterprises this will turn out to be approximately R70 billion. It has to be said that all ministries have today joined in very actively, though some are achieving better results, while others rather worse results, but the important thing is that they have joined in this work.

I can give the following example: The ministry of medium machine building, which is engaged in the development of nuclear power generation in our country, is now going to be the chief ministry for the production of dairy equipment. It is the opinion of the specialists, the major specialists, the scientific centers and workers who have been making equipment for nuclear power plants that manufacturing equipment for dairies isn't something simple, either. From 1990, from the end of the 5-year-plan period, that ministry is now going to supply these dairies with building, equipment, adjustment work, and servicing on an integrated basis. These are completely new approaches to solving the questions of setting up and operating processing enterprises. Of course, the solution of this program will enable us to improve the material and technical base of the processing industry.

A major storage base is being created for vegatables and fruit. It has to be said that today we build storage facilities each year to cope with approximately 2 million tonnes of fruits and vegetables. From next year we are organizing the production of low-termerature coldstores which will enable us to carry out rapid freezing and then ensure the storage of fruit and vegetables by that method. That will be an area parallel with our canning works in processing and storing vegetables.

[Correspondent] Vsevolod Serafimovich, in recent years cooperation between agrarian workers of different countries has been developing successfully. How are other countries participating in the implementation of our plans concerning the food problems?

[Murakhovskiy] I must say that good relations are now taking shape between the agro-industrial complex, the USSR Agro-Industrial Committee, and the agro-industrial complexes of other countries. It must be said that we are cooperating closely with firms in the United States. Good relations are developing with firms in Sweden, the FRG, Austria, and Italy, not to mention the good development of cooperation with our friends, the workers in the agro-industrial complex of the CEMA countries.

Thus, talks have now been completed and a joint enterprise has been set up with the Pioner firm, which specializes in the production of hybrid corn seeds. These hybrids are well-known in our country; we have purchased them. Many seeds, many strains; hybrid seeds of corn have good data, a short vegetative period, suitability for our zone. And now we are organizing joint production of these seeds, on the basis of which hybrid corn seeds will be produced there. Talks are taking place on setting up a joint enterprise between the (Pioner) firm and Orlovskiy Kolkhoz in Stavropol Kray. I can say that talks are taking place with Swedish firms on setting up joint production intensive technologies. The British ICI Company is working jointly with our kolkhozes in the Kuban and in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast on introducing intensive technologies for the growing of grain crops. A firm from the FRG is working on the introduction of intensive technologies for the growing of sugar beet. The American Monsanto Company is working with our farms on the introduction of minimal technologies for working the ground.

All of this is of course the result—I want to stress this again—of the warmth that has now set in as a result of the relaxation of tension, the development of trading relations, and economic cooperation between our countries. It is now strengthening confidence between our peoples, and of course it will serve the interests of the people of all countries of the world.

I take this opportunity to greet all radio listeners on the day of the worker in agriculture and in the processing industry. Of course in the first place I would like to congratulate all workers of the agro-industiral complex and wish them success in fulfilling all those major tasks that now face them, especially the implementation of a busy wintering of cattle, so that they can make a good start and fulfill the plans for the forthcoming year of 1989.

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Continue Experimentation

LD1811225088 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 18 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS—The cosmonauts have completed another working week aboard the MIR space station.

The space crew have done several more experiments involving the ultraviolet telescope "Glazar" under their programme of astrophysical research. Parts of the hemisphere in the Canis Major constellation were photographed on Wednesday.

The "Mariya" magnetic spectrometer was used to measure the flow of high-energy charged particles in the space around planet earth.

The "Svetoblok" unit was used to conduct experiments on synthesis of acryl amide gel that will be used to modernize the production of biologically active substances on earth.

The cosmonauts underwent medical checks that included the evaluation of their cardio-vascular system and an experiment on the peculiarities of carbohydrate exchange in the human body, after a long period of weightlessness.

The station's tanks were being filled with fuel and oxidizer according to the schedule of work with the "progress-38" cargo space craft.

The cosmonauts have been communicating by short wave radio with radio hams from different countries of the world. These talks are transmitted through an antenna Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov erected on the surface of the station during their space walk.

On Friday the space crew will change the used-up water regeneration units and will conduct a number of astrophysical and technical experiments.

The flight is proceeding normally. Vladimir Titov, Musa Manarov and Valeriy Polyakov are all feeling well.

Mir Orbiter's Flight Parameters Adjusted

LD2211112388 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 22 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—Vladimir Titov's and Musa Manarov's work in orbit has entered the 12th month. Valeriy Polyakov has now been in orbit for 85 days.

The crew are now finishing work on board the Progress-38 spacecraft. The delivered cargoes have been stowed in the basic and astrophysical modules. Worn-out components of the onboard systems have been replaced. By means of the propulsion plant of the cargo spacecraft the cosmonauts adjusted the orbit of the manned space complex Mir. The orbit parameters are now as follows:

The maximum distance from the earth's surface—388 km,

The minimum distance from the earth's surface—343 km,

Orbital period—91.6 minutes,

Orbital inclination—51.6 degrees.

Today the cosmonauts are transferring and stowing used equipment into the now vacant compartment of the spacecraft, and on commands from Mission Control Centre they are performing final operations to fill the station's fuel tanks and to provide it with oxidiser.

In accordance with the astrophysical research programme, the cosmonauts carried out a regular series of experiments on November 20 with the use of x-ray telescopes of the Kvant module. The object for observation was the pulsar in Sails constellation.

According to cosmonauts' reports and telemetry data, the flight of the research orbital complex Mir is proceeding normally.

Soviet-Indian Satellite Experiment Scheduled

LD1811213488 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 18 Nov 88

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS—"Nataliya-2", a joint satellite experiment scheduled for 1991, is part of a long-term programme of scientific-technological cooperation between the Soviet Union and India agreed during Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's official friendly visit to the USSR in 1987.

The Soviet satellite involved in the experiment will carry an Indian-made Gamma-telescope, Valentin Kozyrev, deputy chairman of the Intercosmos Council, has told TASS.

Kozyrev pointed out that IRS-1A, an Indian satellite, was put into orbit by a Soviet Vostok rocket from the Baykonur space port last March, something he called "the first commercial launch of a foreign satellite by a Soviet booster."

The first joint Soviet-Indian project in the peaceful exploration of space was the creation in Thumba, near the city of Trivandrum (Kerala State), of a rocket test site for atmospheric sounding.

The data obtained there enables more accurate weather forecasts in both countries.

The hurling [as received] of three more Indian satellites (Aryabhata in 1975, Bhaskara-1 in 1979 and Bhaskara-2 in 1981) into orbit by Soviet boosters marked the next stage of bilateral coopehration. The Soviet side had consulted Indian specialists both at the research and development phase and during preparation for the launches. Besides this, some systems and units used in the projects were Soviet-made.

In 1976, a Soviet-Indian tracking station was set up at the Kawalpur (Tamil Nadu State) Institute of Astrophysics to monitor artifical earth satellites.

In 1977-1981, Soviet and Indian researchers conducted a series of experiments in non-atmospheric astronomy using Soviet-made Gamma-telescopes carried by Indian high-altitude balloons launched from the stratospheric station of the Tata Institute of fundamental research in Hyderabad, close to the geomagnetic equator.

April of 1984 saw a seven-day space mission by a Soviet-Indian crew (Flight Commander Yuriy Malyshev, Flight Engineer Gennadiy Strekalov and researcher Rakesh Sharm) aboard the Soyuz T-11 spacecraft.

The crew carried out a total of eight experiments: six in space medicine, a technological experiment and one to aid Indian mineral extracation.

Nuclear-Powered Vessel Completes Dockside Trials
LD2211100488 Moscow TASS in English 0934 GMT 22 Nov 88

[Text] Kiev November 22 TASS—The first Soviet nuclear-powered lighter carrier successfully completed its dockside trials at the Soviet Black Sea port of Kerch today.

The trials included comprehensive checks on the ship's nuclear reactor designed to meet the requirements of international conventions. The State Acceptance Commission gave a positive rating to the power plant's quality and the reliability of its safeguards. Biological protection devices allow personnel to work near the reactor without the slightest risk to their health.

The lighter carrier, called the Sevmorput (the Russian abbreviation for the northern sea route), will be given an international nuclear safety passport permitting it to call at ports of any country. The ship, which will be used in the arctic, is 260 metres long and 32 metres wide. It can carry 74 lighters—or a whole flotilla of 350-tonne barges—in its holds and on deck. When a lighter carrier comes near a port, a crane lowers the lighters onto the water and a tug tows them to wharves. The Sevmorput will help ensure year-round navigation in the western part of the northern sea route and reliable freight shipments to locations in the extreme north, with considerable savings of transportation costs.

The ship is now to take sea trials in the Black Sea.

Military

Italian Daily Interviews General Yazov
PM2111123288 Rome AVANTI! in Italian 16 Nov 88 p 14

["L.L." interview with USSR Defense Minister General Dmitriy Yazov—date, place not given]

[Text] [Interviewer] What is the reason for the CPSU Central Committee resolution on strengthening military discipline in the Soviet Army and Navy, followed by a CPSU Central Committee Politburo meeting to examine its implementation?

[Yazov] First, I would like to draw the attention of foreign readers to one particular point. Matters relating to the Armed Forces' development have always been followed extremely carefully by our party. The CPSU Central Committee resolution on strengthening military discipline in the Army and Navy was approved at a time when, in line with the requirements of restructuring, a new and more thorough assessment has begun of all aspects of our country's situation, including issues relating to defense, within which context standards of discipline, organization, and order among the troops are a matter of the utmost importance. The Armed Forces are an integral part of our society, sharing its life, and are therefore experiencing the same development problems.

The practical implementation of the CPSU Central Committee resolution demands a major effort on the part of the USSR Defense Ministry—the fundamental political leadership center of the Soviet Army and Navy—as well on the part of as all military personnel, to surmount the negative phenomena in Army and Navy life mainly generated during the period of stagnation. Within the Armed Forces, too, as throughout the whole of society, the need has been asserted for a radical restructuring, whose basic guidelines are laid down precisely in the CPSU Central Committee resolution.

[Interviewer] During the Politburo meeting it was pointed out that the occurrence of nonregulation relations between military personnel, instances of violation of service regulations, and nonfunctioning of Armed Forces weaponry and technical equipment are prompting serious anxiety. In your opinion, what are the main reasons for these phenomena?

[Yazov] The causes are not all of the same kind. The main one is the fact that we have not succeeded in fully exploiting all the opportunities available to us for ensuring that in every unit and on every ship there is constant and strict observance of regulations, which ensures the proper functioning of the entire military body and the creation of a healthy moral and psychological climate within units.

It must be said frankly that instances of violation of regulations and of laxity and neglect by some officers toward their subordinates have not been completely eliminated.

Or let us consider another aspect: How much do officers concern themselves with their troops and sergeants? I am not referring to service contacts, since at that level there probably are no shortcomings. In fact many commanders and political cadres remain in their barracks "from reveille to lights-out," as they say. What is sometimes lacking, however, is the ability to establish a different kind of rapport with the men, to understand their needs, to understand and take account of their interests, and to display a paternal attitude. All this must be constantly learned. In a number of cases there is a tendency to make things appear better than they really are.

In other words, we must increase the effort to strengthen observance of regulations in units and on Navy ships; we must increase operational discipline at all levels. The main objective is to regard individual work with the men as fundamental, and to surmount more resolutely formalism in the political and military training of personnel.

A contribution to the attainment of this objective must come from great openness and glasnost in all sectors of the Army, as well as its democratization within the framework of military laws and regulations.

[Interviewer] What, in your opinion, are the main defects in the training of young people for active military service both before and after the period of the draft?

[Yazov] On the whole, the new forces joining the Army and Navy each year are equal to their tasks. Young people perform their military duties for the defense of the socialist homeland honorably and worthily. However, there are problems here too. It is known that in military life a youngster usually finds himself having to perform more demanding tasks. The physical effort increases and the lifestyle is more rigorous. Unfortunately not everyone is adequately prepared for this new situation.

First, I have in mind the inadequate moral and psychological preparation of some of the youngsters serving in the Army, the solution of difficulties, and the satisfaction of the requirements of regulations and procedures. Many join the Armed Forces ranks equipped with an excessively "domestic" education.

Second, there are instances of individual youngsters being insufficiently aware of their honorable constitutional duty and of their personal responsibility for the homeland's defense. This clearly reflects certain shortcomings in young people's patriotic education.

Third, and last, there must be an improvement in the physical education of youngsters who have not yet reached draft age. It is no secret that some of them are excused military service because of their state of health, whereas others, because of their physical condition, are unable to endure special efforts during the initial period of service.

Of course I have not listed all the problems: I have confined myself to indicating the principal ones, on which we must mainly concentrate our endeavors in preparing youngsters for military service.

[Interviewer] The USSR Defense Ministry and the Army and Navy political leadership have been urged to adopt a range of supplementary measures to strengthen military discipline. What specifically do you have in mind?

[Yazov] The basic aims and objectives related to improving discipline in the Army and Navy are defined in the CPSU Central Committee resolution. The USSR Defense Ministry and the Soviet Army and Navy political leadership have already drawn up and are implementing a system of organizational and educational measures. The main guideline to be followed to increase military discipline remains that of working to ensure discipline in every military unit and on every ship in strict conformity with military regulations.

As for further measures, their main thrust is determined by the Armed Forces' implementation of the principles of restructuring. The issue hinges on the democratization of military life, albeit within the context of strict respect for authority, on the extension of glasnost, and on an increased role for the social institutions. Specifically, a start has been made on implementing a comprehensive officer training and retraining program within the context of the military training institutes and during the actual course of service. Within this framework special attention is devoted to ensuring that graduates learn to work within the context of democratization and glasnost. A restructuring of party work and political work is under way. On the basis of studies and scientific analyses by our military experts, we have drawn up specific suggestions for improving morale in Army and Navy units and eliminating non-regulation relations between military personnel. A special role in this process rests with party and komsomol organizations.

We are continuing with the task of consolidating legal order. Legal training is given. The task of formulating new military regulations is coming to an end. A series of documents have been drawn up that ensure a considerable increase in officers' rights and role in the fulfillment of their responsibilities. Furthermore measures are being adopted with a view to involving every soldier and sailor in the active life of units and Navy ships.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that we face a wide-ranging and demanding task in meeting the party's demands to advance restructuring in the Armed Forces and radically improve military discipline.

Yazov Interviewed Prior to Yugoslav Visit

AU2111135688 Zagreb DANAS in Serbo-Croatian No 352, 15 Nov 88 pp 54-58

["Exclusive" interview with General Dimitriy Yazov, Soviet defense minister, by Miroslav Lazanski, prior to his official visit to the SFRY: "We Are Not Hawks"—in Moscow, 4 November 1988]

[Text] Moscow (from our special correspondent)—The silver-white USSR Ministry of Defense building is situated on the corner of the Kalinin Prospect and Old Arbat, in the very center of Moscow. The Soviet Pentagon has several entrances in front of which the military policemen of the famous Taman division control accesses and traffic. Generally speaking, the building is not especially isolated from the usual city crowd, as is the American Defense Department in Washington.

At the entrance two officers check documents, but as my visit was announced and I was accompanied by Sergey Fedorovich Mikhaylov of the Information Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a colonel who joined him, we go quickly down the long corridors toward the cabinet of the USSR Defense Minister. It is Friday evening and there are not many people in the corridor, but there are the regular check points staffed by

officers who salute us. In front of a big oak door with a large handle, I was met by Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, head of the directorate which handles disarmament negotiations with the Americans (he was interviewed by DANAS in 1986), and Lieutenant General A. Larin, assistant defense minister. We enter a large room, with many telephones, and three adjutants. Gen Larin's office is on the right. At exactly 1830 I enter the personal work cabinet of the Minister of Defense of the USSR. Army General Dimitriy Timofeyevich Yazov stands up and and walks toward me in a cordial manner. He is tall and has a typical wide Russian face with piercing blue eyes. Army Gen Yazov does not like publicity much. This interview with DANAS is his first official interview and the DANAS journalist is the first journalist to have the opportunity to enter his personal cabinet. It is a large room with walls covered by a light beige cloth, a bluish globe in the corner, old busts of Kutuzov and Suvorov on both sides of the entrance way, a desk with a small chair, a separate desk with telephones, among which two special ones stand out (one with a line to Mikhail Gorbachev, I suppose, and the other for contacting top commands and commanders), a large conference table, and a small rostrum-like table, because the defense minister writes and reads while standing. A large red carpet is on the floor and pictures of Marx, Lenin, and Gorbachev are on the walls of the cabinet.

I thank Army Gen Yazov for finding the time for the interview and hand him presents from the DANAS editorial board: a book on the Yugoslav People's Army [YPA] and YPA badges. The general gives me gifts in return: a book about the Soviet Army, a book on Bolshoy Theater, and a large bronze plaque of the USSR's Armed Forces. We are sitting at the large conference table. Marshal Sergey F. Akhromeyev, who joined us in the meantime (he granted an interview to DANAS in 1983), and Col Gen Nikolay Chervov are also present. Conversation between the top Soviet military officials is in the spirit of the Russian military tradition, very cultured, and is conducted in a democratic atmosphere. "You see, Gen Chervov, whom you know very well, was my lecturer at the Frunze Military Academy, but now I am his senior. This is what happens in the Army," Defense Minister Yazov jokingly replies to my question concerning hierarchical relations in the Soviet Armed Forces.

DANAS: Comrade General, the situation in Afghanistan has suddenly become complicated. The withdrawal of the Soviet soldiers from this country has stopped, the Soviet SS-1 missiles have been used for the first time, and, as THE NEW YORK TIMES claims, 30 Soviet MiG-27's have been shipped to the Sindand [spelling of name as published] air base in Afghanistan. What is your comment on this?

Yazov: First of all I would like to say that it is not true that there was a shipment of MiG-27's to Afghanistan. Another thing is that we have fulfilled and are fulfilling our obligations concerning the withdrawal from that country, which cannot be said for the other side. We strictly respect the provisions of the Geneva Agreement and our units are not taking part in combat operations other than those concerning self-defense. The agreement in Geneva was reached with a legitimate Afghan Government and we are obliged to help it to consistently respect this agreement. The other side is continuously breaching the agreement because help to opposition groups is increasing. In this kind of situation all our steps are in fact forced measures.

DANAS: Can your missiles and current activities in Afghanistan be seen in the context of wishes for as safe a final withdrawal as possible, for an evacuation without major losses?

Yazov: Yes, that is right, there is no dilemma about this. Our moves are of a defensive character and we stress that Afghanistan's problems could only be solved in a peaceful way. Our missiles in Afghanistan are exclusively for the purpose of defending Soviet soldiers from the attacks by large group of opposition troops. That is all.

DANAS: Let us return to the problem of disarmament. Is there a global nuclear balance or strategic parity between the USSR and United States?

Yazov: Yes, there is. An approximate balance between the USSR and the United States was achieved in the first half of the 1970's when the USSR, concerned with the consolidation of its security, created nuclear potential comparable to that of the United States. Later, both sides confirmed on several occasions that there was a balance in strategic nuclear arms. At present, the USSR has somewhat more strategic vehicles [nosac] for nuclear arms than the United States (2,494 against 2,286), but the United States has a greater number of nuclear warheads for those vehicles (approximately 14,000:10,000). All in all, there is an approximate balance. However, one must say that the present level of nuclear balance between the two sides is extremely high. Continuing the nuclear arms race can increase the danger of a war to the extent that even the strategic parity would cease to be a factor of strategic stability. This is why the prime objective today is to radically reduce the level of nuclear confrontation. These are, in fact, the positions from which we are negotiating with the United States a 50 percent reduction in strategic nuclear arms.

DANAS: Western military experts claim that, because of the agreement on the elimination of intermediate missiles in Europe, the West was deprived of some systems which, in their opinion, disturbed the strategic balance with the USSR. Is this correct?

Yazov: Look, both sides were deprived of "some systems." However, this has not resulted in tilting the balance in the USSR's favor. In accordance with the Soviet-American agreement on the elimination of intermediate and shorter range missiles, the USSR is destroying almost two times as many missiles as the United States. The question is: Has the West, that is to say, the

United States, "deprived itself" of more modern weapons than the USSR has? Yes, indeed, the United States has eliminated the most modern intermediate missiles, the Pershing II and the ground-based cruise missiles GLSM [acronym as published]. However, the USSR is destroying the equally modern intermediate missiles, the SS-20, and short range missiles, the SS-23. We have also renounced the deployment [razmestanje] of the ground based cruise missiles. In this way a simple comparison of the systems which are eliminated by the United States on the one hand, and the USSR on the other, totally refutes the claim that the agreement on the elimination of intermediate and shorter range missiles has allegedly disturbed the strategic balance between the West and the USSR in the USSR's favor. It is obvious that this theme was artificially launched by those forces in the West which are trying to justify the so-called "compensation" of American nuclear systems in the elimination process, or to be more precise, initiate a new nuclear arms buildup in Europe.

DANAS: What is the current balance of powers concerning conventional weapons between the two alliances in Europe?

Yazov: It is a very complex task to objectively assess the conventional forces' balance of powers between the two military-political alliances in Europe, but this task can be fully resolved. As you know, because of the historic developments, the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact and NATO are very different in terms of their structure and organization. NATO forces are superior in some aspects, while the Warsaw Pact forces are superior in other spheres. This is why an objective picture of the balance of power can only be created on the basis of a thorough and complex approach, i.e., on the basis of a global comparison of the two military blocs rather than on the basis of their individual parts. A selective methodology gives a distorted picture. If we use a complex approach to this problem we can conclude that there is an approximate balance in that sphere. A 3-million men strong armed force belonging to both sides are confronted in Europe. One must say that according to their combat capabilities they are approximately equal, although the full symmetry does not, of course, exist, nor is it possible. However, the parity exists in global terms.

DANAS: What is the situation with numbers concerning conventional balance, and who would have supremacy in the case of a direct clash between the military bloc in the northern, central, and south sector of the front?

Yazov: As far as armed forces and the conventional weapons are concerned, there is a significant imbalance and asymmetry. According to our estimates, the Warsaw Pact has more tanks, while NATO has more tactical strike planes. The Western military alliance is much superior in terms of military-naval forces; NATO is much superior in terms of the number of men in the military-naval forces (4.5 times), in the number of ocean-going vessels (7.6 times), in terms of total tonnage (3 times), and in terms of naval ships in the military-naval forces (2.4 times). Within the global military balance there is also asymmetry regarding the grouping of troops in a direct clash between the two military-political alliances. For instance, the West claims that the Warsaw Pact has superiority in Central Europe, but is not taking into account the French and Spanish armed forces. In addition, Western experts usually forget, for some reason, that NATO has superiority in southern Europe in terms of the general-military formations by about 20 percent; in the number of men, by 50 percent; and in tactical aircraft, by 90 percent. It also has certain superiority in terms of combat helicopters and artillery.

DANAS: So how can one resolve this imbalance and asymmetry in conventional potential in Europe?

Yazov: We are doing our best to realistically assess the situation and the balance of power in Europe, and our assessment confirms only one thing: There is a need to sit behind the negotiating table and search for a solution to this problem. As far as we are concerned, we are ready to start work on this job without any further delay. Our view on how to resolve the problem of imbalance and asymmetry is known. First, one should accurately establish how much of everything the two sides have. In other words, it is necessary to exchange the relevant initial data needed to conduct negotiations; it is necessary to valorize it, to establish the existing imbalance and asymmetry in terms of troops and weapons, and to agree on eliminating them from the side which has the most of them. It is understandable that this process must at the same time be of a reciprocal character, that it should not disturb the global balance, and that it should preserve equal security.

DANAS: Because we are talking about conventional potentials, can a comparison be made between the military doctrines of the Warsaw Pact and NATO?

Yazov: Of course the character of the military doctrines of the Warsaw Pact and NATO can be compared. For instance, the prevention of war is the main postulate in the modern military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact. All the practical moves of allied, socialist countries have the prevention of war as their aim, and, in view of this fact, they aim to stop the arms race, eliminate nuclear weapons, reduce the military potentials to the minimum sensible level, exclude the application of military force, and resolve disputable issues in a peaceful way and through political means. On the other hand, the military doctrine of the United States and NATO treat the war as a possible means of achieving political aims. The basis of this doctrine is force, the position of force, military pressure [fajterski pritisak] and nuclear deterrence. Therefore, this kind of doctrine stimulates the arms race and increases the danger of a war taking place.

DANAS: Do you want to say that the Warsaw Pact military doctrine is defensive and that NATO doctrine is offensive?

Yazov: The most important characteristic of the Warsaw Pact military doctrine is its defensive character. In order to confirm this assertion, I shall cite the following: the existence of the obligation of the member countries of the Warsaw Pact not to start, under any circumstances whatsoever, military operations against one state or alliance of states if they themselves are not subjected to aggression; and our decision never to be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances. Apart from that, the member countries of the Warsaw Pact have no territorial pretensions whatsoever against anyone, nor do they consider any state or people to be their enemy. We are prepared to establish and maintain relations with all countries on the basis of a mutual consideration of the interests of security and peaceful coexistence. On this basis we are also carrying out our military development, formulating military plans, carrying out military preparations, and training and nurturing members of the armed forces of the member countries of the Warsaw Pact.

DANAS: How can you specifically confirm all these assertions?

Yazov: The facts exist. We have considerably reduced the number of major maneuvers of ground, airassault, and seaborne forces. Thanks to the elimination of intermediate and shorter range missiles, the structure of rocket troops is also changing. We are demonstrating restraint in the field of military forces. For example, the process of perfecting the quality of combat techniques and armament is accompanied by certain reductions in their total quantity. The ways of implementing all forms of armed forces are also being examined. Until recently we planned to repel aggressions with defensive as well as offensive operations. Now, however, we are planning defensive operations as the basic form of our combat action. All this is emphasized by the fact that both the political and the military-technical aspects of our doctrines have a unified defensive orientation.

DANAS: Have there perhaps been changes in the military doctrine of NATO in recent times?

Yazov: Well, I can state nothing similar with respect to the military doctrine of the Western military alliance, because this is based on the concept of "nuclear deterrence." This concept belongs to the period of the Cold War and is in essence contradictory and dangerous. Therefore it is impossible to state that a possible nuclear conflict would be a catastrophe for everyone, and at the same time advocate the preservation of nuclear arms with the aim of guaranteeing peace. You know, NATO military doctrine is oriented towards their armed forces being the first to use nuclear weapons. So now we have the paradox: The leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States agreed that a nuclear war should never begin; they have decided to prevent any war between the USSR and the United States. However, at the same time, the United States and NATO refuse to make it their duty not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The policy of the United States and NATO remains unchanged; their policy is to attain global military supremacy over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact—not to reduce their nuclear potential, but to create new systems which will substitute for worn-out ones and those intended for elimination. The Americans strive for the creation of space weapons on the basis of the SDI program, maintain major armed formations in the most significant areas of the world, and elaborately create different scenarios for the use of nuclear weapons—limited, selective, "surgical," and so on. All of this, in fact, affirms the offensive character of the military doctrine of NATO.

DANAS: As minister of defense you recently met your American counterpart, and Marshal Akhromeyev also had talks with the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. armed forces. Do these personal contacts cause better understanding in disarmament? Were there any shifts in the negotiation process between the Soviet Union and the United States after these?

Yazov: There is no simple answer to that. It could not be said that everything was worthless before and now everything is good. However, the truth is that things begin to move after our meetings on the military level, and much of it improved. The Americans always said that we were a closed country, that we concealed everything, and that we did not show anything. Then we showed their defense secretary the Taman guard division here, where you have been, then the Slava class cruiser, our latest strategic bomber, and the Mig-29 fighter planes. Our chief of the General Staff, Akhromeyev, had earlier been in the United States. General Snetkov, the commander of our forces in the GDR, also met his colleague on the other side. In any case, we agreed on an attentive attitude to military questions, and it should be said that we are also implementing joint control of the elimination of intermediate and shorter range missiles according to the signed agreement. At the moment we have no other comments and we believe that they do not have any either. The Soviet Union and the United States have different ideologies but I think that this is not an obstacle to good cooperation.

DANAS: It is usually said that there are "hawks" and "doves" in the American Pentagon. Do such divisions also exist in the Soviet military leadership? Are there Soviet "hawks" and "doves"?

Yazov: Look at all of us here. Here is Marshall Akhromeyev, General Chervov, and me. Which of us looks to you like a "hawk"? We are all the same, are positions are such that we act in harmony, that we do everything collectively in cooperation with the political organs because we are led by our party. If, however, we do have some suggestions which could be discussed, and about which a decision could not be taken immediately, then we present this nicely for discussion and the matter is resolved. All our important military questions are solved

collectively and this is where the party, the Politburo, and the Defense Council play a great role. I repeat, in our country there can be no talk of "hawks" and "doves."

DANAS: There is some quandary in the West about the new Soviet military doctrine of defense sufficiency. What are its essence and basic provisions?

Yazov: Defense sufficiency represents the basic principle of Soviet military development. By this phrase we imply the minimum level of the military possibilities of the state (or coalition of countries), of such a composition and structure of armed forces that will facilitate reliable protection of the country and its allies, but at the same time exclude the possibility of leading major offensive operations. Otherwise, the principle of defense sufficiency assumes total elimination of nuclear, chemical, and bacterial weapons. Judging by everything, these aims cannot be achieved immediately. The total abandonment of nuclear weapons obviously requires a gradual reduction, along with the preservation of balance at all stages, strategic stability, and mutual security. Therefore, as far as strategic offensive armaments are concerned, the principle of defense sufficiency indicates the balance as regards these armaments between the Soviet Union and the United States. Its structure could be different but the potential possibilities at any level must be the same when one talks about the effectiveness of usage. It is in fact from these positions that we are currently negotiating with the United States on a 50 percent reduction in strategic nuclear arms. As far as conventional arms and the armed forces are concerned, defense sufficiency means a combat composition which permits both sides to reject possible aggression but which, allied with this, does not allow one side to threaten the other—not even the conducting of offensive operations. In the practical field, defense sufficiency demands the defensive structuring of the armed forces, limiting the participation of the offensive systems of armaments, changing groupings of armed forces and their redeployment [predislociranje] in considering the defense tasks, as well as a reduction in military production.

DANAS: The Americans and NATO claim that your new doctrine of defense sufficiency is not yet being followed up with practical steps in the units.

Yazov: It will take time for the principle of defense sufficiency to be implemented. We will undertake all the necessary measures to reduce the West's anxiety about the existing groupings of our armed forces. However, the most important thing is awareness that the above-mentioned principle can only be implemented on a reciprocal basis. This is our belief. We have already made relevant proposals to the United States and NATO on several occasions, but have not yet received an answer from them. Therefore, defense sufficiency is not being limited by us, but by the actual actions of the United States and NATO.

DANAS: The question of the role of the military factor in the USSR's foreign policy has also been raised within the context of your new military doctrine. Is this factor now present less and less?

Yazov: Yes, that is right, but some of our opponents—let me be milder: colleagues from the other bloc—say that this has not yet been noticed. Perhaps they do not want to notice it.

DANAS: Much is being said in the world and in the USSR about restructuring. What is the situation with restructuring in the Soviet Armed Forces?

Yazov: Restructuring and revolutionary transformations are taking place in all spheres of life in the USSR. As far as the USSR Armed Forces are concerned, restructuring is taking deeper roots. One must say that much has been done in this respect. Restructuring is above all in the minds of generals and officers, but at the same time it is also present in our practical activities. For instance, in the nuclear age that is ours, war has ceased to be the means of achieving political aims. This correct principle should be given a meaning and we should also determine its effects on military development. I will mention another example: The USSR's obligation not to use nuclear weapons and start military operations first is an unavoidable imperative in the training of our Army commands and troops, in organizing strict control to prevent the unauthorized use of nuclear missiles, in strengthening the combat readiness of our troops in terms of how they are technically equipped, in the sphere of command and communications, as well as in the process of improving the moral-political aspect of the men. These are not empty words, but a concrete program of developing our Armed Forces. We are trying to give meaning to the directives of the CPSU concerning restructuring at all levels, so that they can be applied in military activities. In my view, our main task is to elevate our Armed Forces to a qualitatively new level by advancing the style of military officers activities, through resolute improvements in the efficiency of the combat and political training, and through the affirmation of everything that could contribute to the strict respect of the service's rules. Restructuring, which is being directly put into practice in our troops, concerns in most cases the human factor. Glasnost and democracy have imposed a need to intensify well-mannered work and to improve its forms and methods. Priority is given to individual forms, to well-mannered work which strengthens combat readiness in people, and to honest and just conduct. Our army is a multinational army and the task of developing national-patriotic feelings among the people has therefore been given even greater meaning.

DANAS: The Soviet Armed Forces have long been operating on the principle of organization and classification according to battlefields. What has been achieved with this?

Yazov: I can say that the principle of centralizing control has been and will remain one of our chief principles. In accordance with the USSR Constitution, the Defense Council is the highest organ in our country which directly controls the organization of defense. The draft constitutional amendments, which have been put forward for a public debate, propose that in the future the Defense Council be under control of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

DANAS: How do you view Yugoslavia's current military-political position?

Yazov: I have never been to your country. I will soon meet Colonel General Veljko Kadijevic, federal secretary for national defense, and I hope that we will discuss these issues.

DANAS: Well, since you are already going to visit our country, could you say how you, in view of your knowledge, see our position from the military point of view?

Yazov: I would not want to say anything specific about this because I would like to discuss this with Gen Kadijevic first. I would not like to have to correct my current assessments after I have learned something new.

The conversation is over. I am leaving the office of the USSR Minister of Defense and at the door I meet Viktor G. Kulikov, the Supreme Commander of the Warsaw Pact forces (he granted an interview to DANAS in 1987). We cordially recall our last meeting. Marshal Kulikov looks like he is in a much better shape than 1 year ago. He said that he was pleased with last year's front page of DANAS. The working day was not over yet and on that cold Moscow evening, 4 November, I also had the rare pleasure of meeting and talking to the elite Armed Forces of the Soviet Union.

Strategic Rocket Forces Deputy Chief Interviewed

LD2011191188 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 20 Nov 88

[Text] Today is Rocket Troops and Artillery Day. Our correspondent is talking with Colonel-General Kochemasov, first deputy commander-in-chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces:

[Kochemasov] Our festival is a special one. It is glorious for the fact that it had its beginnings in the heroic events of the Great Patriotic War. It was instituted in 1944 in honor of the artillery exploits. The strategic rocket troops have become the heirs to the heroic traditions of the frontline artillerymen. For this reason, since 1964 this festival has been marked as Rocket Troops and Artillery Day.

[Unidentified correspondent] We know that the strategic rocket forces were created as a countermeasure to a real threat against us.

[Kochemasov] Yes, we were forced to respond to the arms race that was imposed on us, and respond not so much by political means as by military means. The separating of the strategic rocket forces into a separate arm of the Armed Forces demanded the speedy solution of many very complex problems. The chief of these was the creation of complex rocket equipment, the construction of launching positions and rocket complexes, and the drawing up of the principles governing the combat use of the troops and their management. The rocket troops are permanently on alert duty. They must be ready at any moment for retaliatory action. Our high combat readiness deters a potential aggressor. This was and remains the basic and main task of our rocket troops.

[Correspondent] Our army exists for the defense of the Soviet people and for the defense of peace. Will the process of reducing a whole class of medium and shorter-range missiles and other possible accords in the future not lower the level of our defense capability?

[Kochemasov] There is no alternative to reducing armaments, but it will be effective if it is carried out on a mutually acceptable basis, maintaining parity at each specific stage. The elimination of weapons is valuable to all of mankind only when it is conducted on an equal basis without detriment to mutual security and with strict compliance with treaty obligations regarding antimissile defense.

With such an approach, the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles will not lower defense capability. Time is changing the face of the planet and relations between states on the Earth, but what is not changing is our moral social position. Defense of the socialist fatherland is the sacred duty of every citizen of the USSR and the work of the whole Soviet people, and this must be the case for as long as there is a need for it.